The American Ecclesiastical Review

VOL. CXXIX, No. 3 SEPTEMBER, 1953

CONTENTS

John Henry Newman to John Gilmary Shea
J. Richard Quinn 145

Decor Carmeli .... *Igino Cecchetti* 149

The Holy Name in the Early Church ..... *F. X. Curley, S.J.* 152

Orestes Brownson on Salvation and the Church
Thomas R. Ryan, C.PP.S. 157

The Truth About the Holy Shroud, Part III
Edward A. Wuenschel, C.SS.R. 170

Knights of the Altar .... *Timothy J. Sullivan* 188

Theology and Nationality .... *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 192

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Eucharistic Fast for a Priest 196

Baptismal Record of an Illegitimate Child 196

Indirect Contraception 197

A Case of Bilocation 198

Requiem Mass Problem 198

Holy Communion Outside of Mass 199

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1953, by The Catholic University of America Press

(Contents Continued from Previous Page)

Infant's Funeral 199

Mass to be Said 200

Oratio imperata 200

Imitation Candles 201

Pontifical Mass Problems 201

Mass of Thanksgiving 201

Sanctuary Lamp Problem Again 202

Placing Statues in the Church 202

ANALECTA 203

BOOK REVIEWS

So Much, So Soon, *by Katherine Burton* 208

So Near is God, *by James M. Gillis, C.S.P.* 210

The Spiritual Director, *by Father Gabriel, O.C.D.* 212

The Morality of Prizefighting, *by George C. Bernard, C.S.C.* 213

The Stained Glass Windows in the recently consecrated St. Mary's Cathedral, Ogdensburg, New York, Most Rev. Bryan J. McEntegart, D.D., LL.D., were designed and executed by

Edward W. Hiemer & Co.

141 Wabash Avenue
Clifton, New Jersey

Practical suggestions for parochial administration by a wise and experienced priest

THE SHEPHERD AND HIS FLOCK

By The Right Reverend
CORNELIUS J. HOLLAND

With a Preface by the
Most Reverend Russell J. McVinney

"The forthright and frank approach to real problems of the parochial situation is not the least merit of this book. A very healthy realism pervades all of it: a realism, however, which never veils for long the deeper idealism and spirituality that illumine every page."—*Providence Visitor*

"Monsignor Holland indicates skillfully how the inner and the outer life of the modern American priest may be fused to produce a genuine 'man of God'."
—*Reverend James M. Gillis*

At your bookstore . $3.00

DAVID McKAY CO., Inc. 55 Fifth Ave., N. Y. 3

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN TO JOHN GILMARY SHEA

The following letter, a recent gift to the present writer, seems of sufficient importance to merit publication in this *Review,* so that the information it conveys may be available to those who are interested in Cardinal Newman. Apparently the letter has not been published up to this time; at least the standard works on Newman and the collections of his letters do not contain it. Fr. Henry Tristam of the Birmingham Oratory, to whom for his kindness and helpfulness I am most grateful, has informed me that he was unable to find a copy of the letter in the Birmingham archives.

The Oratory, Birmingham
April 2, 1860

My dear Sir

Though I have delayed to answer your letter & to acknowledge the receipt of your kind present, you must not think that therefore I have not valued either the one or the other. On the contrary, I had been struck with your work, as it appears in the columns of the Freeman, & had cut it out, as it was published there. It was a great gratification then, to receive a copy from the author—& it is not the first of that sort which I am indebted for to you.

Your volume indeed is of great importance—and it is pleasant to think that it is written by a Catholic, and not, as the corresponding English work, by a member of a hostile communion, who carps at the labours and exertions which he has undertaken to record.

I hear[?] that your excellent and learned Archbishop, who has published so much of a new version of Scripture, is proceeding with his great work. The Bishops of his Province made a representation to our Hierarchy on the subject of it—but though I have been in frequent communication with our Bishop on the subject, I do not think he is aware of any answer having been made to them. Nor could I gather how the matter stood, from a conversation which I had last summer with his Eminence, Cardinal Wiseman. This makes me think that the matter is before Propaganda.

Repeating my thanks, & begging the blessing of your most Rev. Prelate, when you see him,

I am, My dear Sir

Yours most truly

John H. Newman

John Gilmary Shea Esq

The task of identifying the book which Shea sent to Newman is a difficult one. There is no copy of the letter of Shea to Newman in the Birmingham Archives; in Father Tristam's opinion, this is probably because Newman did not consider Shea's letter important enough to retain. The only book by Shea in Newman's library is the one entitled *History of the Catholic Missions among the Indian Tribes of the United States 1529-1854.* This was published in 1857. It is impossible to determine whether this is the book to which Newman here refers or one which Shea had sent previously.

The reference to the appearance of the book serially in the "Freeman" has not led to its identification. Newman is probably speaking of the *Dublin Freeman's Journal* but as the issues for the years concerned are not available in this country, it has been impossible to check. A survey of the *New York Freeman's Journal* failed to lead to the discovery of any of Shea's works having appeared there during the several years to which, we might reasonably assume, Newman could have been referring.

Newman's praise of the Shea book over "the corresponding English work" could possibly be taken as meaning that the book he received was Shea's translation of De Courcey's *History of the Catholic Church in the United States,* which was published in 1856. In this case it is conceivable that the English work is the first volume of James Anthony Froude's *History of England,* which also appeared in 1856. Newman would have been familiar with Froude's book both because of its popularity in England and because of his own association with the author during the Tractarian Movement. Lending credence to this theory is the fact that Froude does speak harshly of the Catholic Church in his work.[1]

Of more general interest is the latter part of the letter, which has reference to the translations of the Scripture by Newman and Archbishop Kenrick.

In 1857 Cardinal Wiseman invited Newman to undertake the work of editing a new English version of the Bible. After several months of deliberation, Newman accepted the task. In the meantime, Archbishop Kenrick had begun a translation and on May 8, 1858, the Ninth Provincial Council of Baltimore appointed a committee to look into the matter of the two proposed translations and attempt to work out a solution whereby both Newman and Kenrick would work together on one translation. The committee was also to explain the matter to Propaganda; and in case the plan for a joint work did not materialize, it was to try to win the approval of Rome for the American edition for the Province of Baltimore.[2]

The American bishops notified Cardinal Wiseman of their stand and sent him a copy of the resolution passed at the Council. Wiseman sent these, through Bishop Ullathorne, to Newman. This proved to be the end of Newman's edition, for, failing to receive further instructions from the Cardinal, he did not feel justified in continuing. From the letter to Shea it is evident that Newman persisted in his attempt to discover Wiseman's position on the matter but failed. Because the American plan for a joint effort was not successful, Newman concluded that the matter was before Propaganda in accordance with the Baltimore resolution.

Shea showed this letter of April 2 to Archbishop Kenrick and on May 12, 1860, sent to Newman a copy of a letter in which the Archbishop explained his position.[3] In the note which he wrote

---

[1] It was a subsequent volume of Froude's work which occasioned a review by Charles Kingsley. In this Kingsley accused Newman of maintaining that truth for its own sake need not be a virtue with the Roman clergy. To answer this charge Newman wrote his *Apologia.*

[2] Cf. copy of resolution in Yale-Birmingham Archives, "Translation of Scripture 1857-1860," Batch 157, Reel 99.

[3] Cf. *loc. cit.*

Shea explains that he is not a member of Kenrick's diocese but of that of Archbishop Hughes, New York.

In answer to this May communication from Shea, Newman wrote to Kenrick directly congratulating him and apologizing for any uncertainty from which Kenrick may have suffered as a result of the lack of response from the English Hierarchy.[4]

J. RICHARD QUINN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

---

[4] Cf. W. Ward, *The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman* (New York, 1912), I, 427.

CARDINAL NEWMAN'S LITERARY STYLE

Style includes the thought as well as its expression. If one must select between words and thoughts, the latter is after all the chief thing. But there is no necessity for doing so. The outpouring of the thought is never faultless unless the thought itself be clear. He who does not think clearly cannot write well. Newman was master of the thought and of the word. Whilst it does not follow that every intensely spiritual man is an accomplished essayist, there is sound meaning conveyed by him who said Newman was a great writer, because he was a good man. As he himself says of a gentleman that he is one who avoids all restraint and puts people at their ease, so may it be said of his style, that it is perfectly easy and entirely free from mannerisms.

—Father John Conway, in "Cardinal Newman as a Stylist," in *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* IV, 5 (May, 1891), 378.

DECOR CARMELI

Among the many and beautiful titles with which the Church honors the Mother of God, that of "Queen and Beauty of Carmel" is certainly one of the most significant and one of the dearest to Christian hearts. However, its lofty meaning, essentially messianic, escapes a great number of the faithful, and to seize this at source, it is necessary to examine the texts with which the Church herself commemorates "Our Lady of Mount Carmel" (July 16) and which she offers for meditation in the liturgy.

The Communion of the Mass of the day is interesting, because it proclaims above all the royalty of Mary as "Queen of the world" *Regina mundi dignissima.*

To celebrate her glories, the Roman Breviary then evokes the divine poetry of the Bible inspired by the beauty of that magnificent promontory of northern Palestine, Mount Carmel. It was there that Elias, the father of all the prophets, saw the mysterious cloudlet ascend from the sea and knew if as a pre-eminent symbol of the Virgin.

The antiphon of the Benedictus recalls the text of the Canticle of Canticles (7:5): "Caput tuum ut Carmelus"—"Thy head is like Carmel." Le Hir comments on this: "The majesty of her head is veiled by grace and resembles Mount Carmel, whose smiling slopes are shaded by flowering vineyards and delighted by gardens." Thus the daring imagery of the Orient puts into sharp relief the incomparable grace and dignity that is personal to the Blessed Virgin.

The antiphon of the Magnificat, taken from Isaias (35:2), seeks to describe the mission of this privileged creature, masterpiece of the Almighty: "Gloria Libani est ei, decor Carmeli et Saron" (i.e. the glory of Libanus is given to her, the beauty of Carmel and Saron are hers). These names remind the prophet of the fabulous riches of the Orient of antiquity: Libanus with its superb heights, its gigantic trees and its famous cedars; Carmel with the beauty of its woods and vineyards; Saron, the plain that follows the coast from Carmel to Jaffa, whose fertility was proverbial. These are three names that designate the best zones of Palestine and represent what fancy could consider most fertile and agreeable in mountains, forests and fields.

To understand the deep meaning of this verse, we must remember that it is part of a text in which the prophet describes the return from exile, the golden age to be restored by the Messias; therefore it is a messianic text. We know that it is usual for the prophets to present the messianic era as a mystical return to the lost paradise of Eden, and the marvelous effects of the Redemption as the happiness and the beauties of that paradise (cf. *Isaias* 51; *Ez.* 13:8, 12; *Zach.* 14:8). The desert will be transformed into a garden (*Isaias* 58:11-12), and the fruitfulness of the earth will be associated with the justice of peoples (*Isaias* 32:15-16; 61:11). Nature herself will feel this admirable renewal by the Messias: the transformation of the physical world will go hand in hand with that of the spiritual world; the fulness of the Redemption will cover the whole universe, restoring souls and ennobling creation that had been destined to be the worthy seat of the sons of God, especially at the end of time, which is the ultimate perspective of the prophets. Then, "Caeli novi et terra nova" will be inaugurated for all eternity (*Isaias* 66:22).

It is in this frame of marvelous messianic beauty that the Church contemplates the Blessed Virgin as Mother of the Redeemer and Coredemptrix of mankind. Thus, during *Advent,* she bids us sing with the accents of Isaias himself (45:8): "Rorate, caeli, desuper, et nubes pluant justum; aperiatur terra, et germinet Salvatorem" ("Drop down dew, ye heavens, from above, and let the clouds rain the just; let the earth be opened, and bud forth a Saviour." This fruitful earth is the Virgin who gathers into herself all the beauties of creation: the glory of Libanus, the variety of Carmel, and the fruitfulness of Saron.

The rythmical verse of the Alleluia of the Mass in honor of our Lady of Mount Carmel gives the authentic interpretation of this:

Per te, Dei genitrix,
  nobis est vita perdita data:
quae de caelo suscepisti prolem,
  et mundo genuisti Salvatorem.
("Through thee, Mother of God, the life
  we forfeited has been regained;
heaven quickened thy womb, and from it
  came forth into the world a Saviour.")

In giving birth to Jesus, Mary, who found the world in mourning, healed the wounds inflicted by sin and lifted the world out of its misery. She is the mystical Eden, "the rational Paradise" (Saint Germanus in the Roman Breviary Dec. 8), where the children of God are re-created—the children to whom she presents the blessed fruit of her virginal bosom, destroying the poison deposited in us by the fruit of Eve. Thus a complete renewal of life and joy smiles in the universe through the Queen of all creation.

We can call Mary *Decor Carmeli* because, considered in herself she represents the maximum of perfection, the supreme ideal of the Redemption. The name Carmel signifies fruitful garden (cf. *Isaias* 10:18, *Jer.* 2); the loveliness and smiling beauty of this name remind us of the garden of Eden. In the texts of the prophets (e.g. *Isaias* 32:15-16) it is the living image of the messianic era, the eloquent symbol of the admirable regeneration, the universal renewal that the Messias will accomplish: "Donec effundatur super nos spiritus de excelso. Et erit desertum in carmel . . . et justitia in carmel sedebit" ("Until the spirit be poured upon us from on high: and the desert shall be as a carmel [garden] . . . and justice shall sit in carmel").

This delightful garden, figure of the eternal kingdom of justice and peace proper to the Messias (*Isaias* 32:15-20), is the Blessed Virgin, the most noble offspring of the root of Jesse (*Isaias* 11:1). She is its most beautiful ornament, its shining splendor, greeted by the Angel in the divine phrase: *Gratia plena.*

Mary is the elect among creatures, "the beauty and the honor of the human generation." She alone is the Immaculate, the purest, brightest ornament of Carmel, the resplendent glory of the Church.

Mystical authors justly name Carmel the holy mountain of Christian life, the summit of perfection and of contemplation and Mary is its sublime ideal. So for her glory and for the comfort of our souls we have the august and beloved title, "Queen and Beauty of Carmel,"—*Regina decor Carmeli.*

Mater et decor Carmeli is the special way the Carmelites, those "faithful sons of the prophet" invoke her, hailing her as the proud boast of their Order, drawing strength from her maternal royalty to ascend ever higher the peaks of perfection and extend in the world her immortal reign.

IGINO CECCHETTI

Vatican City

THE HOLY NAME IN THE EARLY CHURCH

While the feast of the Holy Name, usually observed on the first Sunday of each new year, has been universally celebrated only since the sixteenth century, devotion to the name of Jesus is of ancient lineage. Almost sixteen hundred years ago a successor to Saint Peter had a marked feeling for this pious custom. Indeed, he wrote three poems on the subject which we still possess today.

Saint Damasus (366-384) was one of the most celebrated pontiffs of the fourth century Church. For nearly two decades he struggled manfully to consolidate the reign of Christ within the empire of Rome. He fought against a heretical bishop, an apostate emperor, and an anti-pope. Throughout such a turbulent era, conscious of the perpetuity of the Church, and conscious of the holy interest of future ages in the origins of Christianity, he worked valiantly to preserve and adorn the catacombs, but recently the home of a hunted Church. He caused the land immediately adjacent to the catacombs and to Saint Peter's to be drained, so that seepage of swampwater would not destroy the relics of primitive Christian worship.[1] Many tombs and chapels were graced by metrical epitaphs or metrical inscriptions of his own composition. "They abound in errors of prosody, but also in dogmatic allusions of very great value."[2]

The Church has never been free from the assaults of her enemies, and the lifetime of Pope Damasus was emphatically not an exception. One of the heresies of the day was Arianism, which taught that the Son was not consubstantial with the Father, not equal to the Father in dignity, not co-eternal with the Father, not, in a word, God. In his allocutions and letters, and also in his poetry, the Pope firmly emphasized the kingship and equality of the Son of God, while giving special emphasis to the name Jesus. A poem which has come down to us simply as "Number Five" answers Arius with an acrostic. The first letter of each line spells out the Holy Name, while the thought of the poem states the implacable opposition of the Church to Arianism.[3]

---

[1] For archeology, restoration, etc., of tombs, monuments, and catacombs adorned with Damasus' writings, cf. *Roma sotteranea*, 2nd ed. (London: Worthcote and Brownlow, 1878).

[2] Bardenhewer, *Patrology* (Freiburg, 1908), p. 421.

> Joint builder of the ages, with equal sway He reigns,
> Enthroned beside His Father upon the star-lit heights,
> Surveying by His Godhead His kingly vast domains.
> Upon the sea and earth, on all, His royal glance alights;
> Supplying mankind's every need, all creatures He sustains.

Another poem, "Number Four," in the same mood and with somewhat the same purpose, again an acrostic, can be translated as follows:[4]

> Joined in work of highest worth the Trinity now stands,
> Ennobling our weak nature, arousing praise within.
> Salvation comes; the Saviour, the world held in His hands,
> Unties by His great fruits the stiffened knot of sin.
> Supreme our Saviour reigns, the glory of all lands.

In addition to fighting against the heresy of Arianism, even to the extent of excommunicating the recalcitrant Bishop of Milan, Pope Damasus held two Synods at Rome (A.D. 368, 369), during which he condemned Apollinarianism and Macedonianism.[5]

A spiritual warrior, the Saint was granted a great favor by God. Unlike so many saints and martyrs who never live to see the fruits of their labor and sufferings, Damasus survived the dark days and saw his beloved Church enter upon a happier era. He "lived to welcome the famous edict of Theodosius I, '*De Fide Catholica*' (Feb. 27, 380) which proclaimed as the religion of the Roman State that doctrine which St. Peter had preached to the Romans and of which Damasus was supreme head (Cod. Theod., xvi, 1, 2)."[6]

---

[3] *MPL*, XIII, 378. My translation expresses the ideas of the original, but due to the exegencies of the acrostic, they are slightly transposed. The Latin original runs as follows:

> Jure pari regnat communis conditor aevi
> Et cum Patre pia regnat sublimis in arce
> Siderio sanctis insidit numine regnis.
> Unde mare et terras solo videt omnia nutu
> Suggerit humanis, et donat munera rebus.

[4] *Ibid.*, 377:

> In rebus tantis Trina conjunctio mundi
> Erigit humanum sensum laudare venuste:
> Sola salus nobis et mundi summa potestas
> Venit peccati nodum dissolvere fructu
> Summa salus cunctis nituit per saecula terris.

[5] Cf. Mansi, *Coll. conc.*, 9th ed., III, 447-49.

As for the man himself, his secretary, Saint Jerome, has left us this forthright testimony of his worth: "A most outstanding man, very learned in the Holy Scriptures, and the Virgin Doctor of a Virgin Church."[7] That final phrase is in reference to one of the Saint's greatest trials. In a futile but cruel effort to undermine the authority of Damasus, the anti-pope Ursicinus accused him of adultery. A trial was held by order of the Emperor, and the convocation of some forty bishops together with the Emperor's lawyers found the charge to be a baseless and spite-inspired conspiracy. But the personal damage to the holy Pontiff's sensitive spirit must have been enormous. In this, as in his other tribulations, Damasus found peace in prayer.

Among the many accomplishments of this pontificate, mention might be made of the fact that the canon of the Holy Scriptures was fixed, rules were laid down for a uniform method of singing the Psalms during Divine Office, and the *Gloria Patri* was ordered added to the end of the Psalms in honor of the Most Holy Trinity. Damasus prevailed upon his secretary to undertake a Latin revision of the Bible, the Vulgate edition, which has been a standard work for the last sixteen hundred years. He "added to his own intrinsic greatness by his confidence in Saint Jerome,"[8] and in a true sense we owe the Vulgate to both men.

The simple piety of the Saint, glimpsed in his acrostic verses, is seen throughout his many poems on the saints, and in his poems on the basic Christian beliefs, especially his child-like expression of faith in a glorious future life because Christ had said it was so. This simplicity of soul led him to compose what is surely one of the most unusual poems in all Christian letters. Damasus pored over the books of both the Old and New Testaments and made a long list of the names applied to Our Lord throughout scriptural history. When he felt that the list was complete, the Pope arranged all these names in metrical sequence. That's all there is to the poem, a listing of Jesus' titles. The idea sounds almost too simple, but when he finished his task the result was extraordinarily impressive. Much of the effect is, I believe, achieved precisely by the cumulative technique he employed, just as the Christmas Martyrology hypnotizes us by the piling up of date after date and era after era until finally the birth of the Saviour is dramatically announced. Here is the evocative result of the Holy Father's biblical browsings:[9]

---

[6] *Catholic Encyclopedia*, IV, 613-14.

[7] *S. Hieronymi opera omnia* (ed. Verona, 1734), I, 228D.

[8] De Montor, *The Lives and Times of the Popes* (New York, 1910), I, 109.

> Our Life and Light, our Wisdom, Hope, our Order and Salvation,
> Our Jewel, Prophet, Warrior, King and Priest of Mediation;
> God-with-us, Pillar, Greenwood, Rock, our Olive-branch and Wine,
> Messias, Teacher, Lord of Hosts, our Shepherd, Root and Vine;
> Our Gate and Fountain, Judge and Lawyer, Stone and House and Wall,
> Our Sheep and Calf, our Lion, Lamb, our Spouse, our Peace, our All;
> The Son of Man, the Word, the Hand, the Net to draw us near,
> Our Christ, our Jesus last of all, the Name of names most dear.

Many of the above titles, while ringing a vague bell for us, do not ring it with perfect pitch because of today's lamentable lack of familiarity with the Old Testament. For those who faced a similar difficulty in the fifth century and wanted to find out just what each name signified, Orientius went Damasus one better. In a lengthy poem on the Holy Name, Bishop Orientius used the epithets collected by the Pope, and proceeded to explain each one. The explanations foreshadow the ingenious and often ingenuous exegesis of the Middle Ages, but have a unique charm for twentieth century minds, weary of the probing over-subtleties that so much complicate writing today.[10]

---

[9] *MPL*, XIII, 378. As is stated above, the original contains *only* titles; the other words in the translation, especially in the last two lines, have been inserted by this despairing translator. The Latin original:

> Spes, Vita, Salus, Ratio, Sapientia, Lumen,
> Judex, Porta, Gigas, Rex, Gemma, Propheta,
> Sacerdos, Messias, Sabaoth, Rabbi, Sponsus,
> Mediator, Virga, Columna, Manus, Petra,
> Filius, Emmanuelque, Vinea, Pastor, Ovis,
> Pax, Radix, Vitis, Oliva Fons, Paries, Agnus,
> Vitulus, Leo, Propitiator, Verbum, Homo,
> Rete, Lapis, Domus, Omnia, Christus, Jesus.

When one wishes to sum up the essence of a particular saint, the Mass of his feast day will usually supply the clue. This is certainly true of Pope St. Damasus. In the Communion of his Proper (Dec. 11) we find a text which perfectly sets off a pontiff who was a learned scholar, a fearless fighter, an accomplished poet, a loving father, and a holy priest of God.

"Lord, thou didst deliver to me five talents, behold, I have gained other five over and above. Well done, thou good and faithful servant, because thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will place thee over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."[11]

F. X. Curley, S.J.

Weston College
Weston, Mass.

---

[10] Cf. *MPL,* LXI, 1003 ff. While this text is quite satisfactory, the critical edition may be found in *CSEL,* XVI.

[11] *Matt.* 25: 20-21.

ORESTES BROWNSON ON SALVATION AND THE CHURCH

Perhaps no public figure in the history of our country ever discussed salvation and the church more frequently than did Orestes A. Brownson in the erudite columns of his *Review*. Archbishop Kenrick, a constant friend of Brownson, also contributed an elaborate treatise on this particular matter to Brownson's *Review* when ostensibly reviewing Dr. White's "Life of Mother Seton."[1] What is of special interest in the writings of both is that both dealt at considerable length with the practical aspects of the question, namely, to what extent might one reasonably presume in those outside the Church that charity and supernatural faith required for the validity of an implicit desire of belonging to the Church? Or to what extent, generally speaking, might one easily presume so-called good faith on those outside the Church? The fact that Brownson himself was a convert to the faith invests his writings on these points with a peculiar interest.

Brownson's original exposition of the dogma, however, was written "at the command" of Bishop J. B. Fitzpatrick of Boston, and "was revised and approved by him" before its publication.[2] In fact, Bishop Fitzpatrick was the theological censor of all Brownson's writings for eleven years after Brownson's conversion, and it was he also who gave Brownson a systematic course in theological studies immediately after his conversion, specializing in Billuart's commentary on the *Summa theologica*, the *Summa* itself, and some of St. Augustine's works.[3] When replying late in life to a certain critic who had misrepresented his interpretation of the Church's claim of exclusive salvation, Brownson referred to the fact that he had been trained "in the school of the late Bishop of Boston, a theologian, whose exactness and soundness we, every day we advance in life, find confirmed, and whose teachings we but feebly reproduce."[4] But Brownson, of all men, never learned any thing by rote. Whatever he studied, his immensely inquisitive mind canvassed closely, and when he came to accept any thing as the truth, it became an intimate part of his intellectual composition and life. And so it was with his study and interpretation of this particular dogma. He always wrote on it with a deep personal conviction that comes from no little study and reflection.

---

[1] Brownson's Works, XX, 394; *Brownson's Quarterly Review* (1853), p. 165.

[2] *Works*, XX, 394.

[3] *Brownson's Middle Life*, by his son Henry, p. 4. Speaking of Bishop Fitzpatrick in his autobiography, Brownson said: "He was my instructor, my confessor, my spiritual director, and my personal friend, for eleven years; my intercourse with him was intimate, cordial, and affectionate, and I owe him more than it is possible to owe any other man. I have met men of more various erudition and higher scientific attainments; I have met men of bolder fancy and more creative imaginations; but I have never met a man of a clearer head, a firmer intellectual grasp, a sounder judgment, or a warmer heart. He taught me my catechism and my theology; and,

The doctrine that Brownson uniformly set forth was that in order to be saved one must belong in some real sense to the *body* of the Church even though one be not necessarily a member of the visible communion of the Church actually. He understood the dogma in the natural, obvious meaning of its wording. There are no rhetorical flourishes in the solemn definitions of the Church, he said, and pointed out the extremely exclusive wording of this particular dogma by the Fourth Lateran Council when it inserted the little word "omnino": *Una vero est fidelium universalis ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur.* The dogma, therefore, can never admit of any real exception. Hence, when he so often found others—mostly authors of popular literature—explaining away this dogma through a misunderstanding and misapplication of the distinctions of theologians, he thought great harm was being done, and he registered his firm protest. Nor could he agree with some modern theologians who seemed to favor the theory that salvation may be had through belonging to "the soul of the church." "When, Brownson said, "the Holy Scriptures, the Fathers, the popes, and

---

though I have found men who made a far greater display of theological erudition, I never met an abler or a sounder theologian. However for a moment I may have been attracted by one or another theological school, I have invariably found myself obliged to come back at last to the views he taught me. If my *Review* has any theological merit, if it has earned any reputation as a staunch and uncompromising defender of the Catholic faith, that merit is principally due, under God, to him, and his uniform support. Its faults, its shortcomings, or its demerits, are my own" (*Works*, V, 169).

[4] *Works*, XX, 406.

councils speak of the Church, in connection with salvation, they always, as far as we have observed, speak of the visible Church, or the Church in the concrete, not of an invisible church, or the Church as a disembodied spirit. In a letter I addressed through a theologian to the late cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda, mindful of the qualifications some modern theologians give to the dogma, and of some articles I had read in the *Civiltà Cattolica,* I said: 'I shall never leave the Church, for I am certain there is no salvation out of her communion, *at least for me.*' The cardinal noticed the apparent limitation, and in the name of the Holy See, rebuked it, and asked: 'Does il Signore Brownson believe that there is salvation for any one else out of the communion of the Church?' "[5]

But this interpretation of the dogma in no way excludes the possibility of salvation for any who have the desire, explicit or implicit, of belonging to the Church, provided the desire be animated by the requisite dispositions of soul. For our Holy Father speaks of those possessed of an implicit desire of belonging to the Church as "unsuspectingly . . . related to the Mystical Body of the Redeemer."[6] Explaining the dispositions of soul required for the efficacy unto salvation of a desire of belonging to the Church, whether explicit or implicit, the Aug. 8, 1949, Letter of the Holy Office says:

> However, this desire need not always be explicit, as in the case of catechumens; but when a person is involved in invincible ignorance, God accepts also an *implicit desire,* so called because it is included in that good disposition of soul whereby a person wishes his will to be conformed to the will of God. . . . But it must not be thought that any kind of a desire of entering the Church suffices that one be saved. It is necessary that the desire by which one is related to the Church be animated by perfect charity. Nor can an implicit desire produce its effects, unless a person has supernatural faith. "For he that cometh to God must believe that God exists and that He is a rewarder of those who seek Him." (*Heb.* 11:6).

The whole case, therefore, for the possibility of salvation for those who apparently live and die outside the Church would seem to turn on whether they attain to these two dispositions of soul, perfect charity and supernatural faith, in cases where a desire, at least implicit, of belonging to the Church is had. It is into these practical aspects of the question that both Archbishop Kenrick and Brownson went in no small detail. Neither seemed to think that these qualities of soul may be easily presumed in those of our countrymen still alien to the visible communion of the Church. All that can be done in an article of this kind, however, is to present a few of their main thoughts and reasonings on the subject. Both drew largely on St. Augustine in their argumentation.

---

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 394.

[6] *Mystici Corporis, AAS,* XXXV (1943), 243.

In his original exposition of the dogma, Brownson asserted that while there may be persons in heretical societies who are guiltless of the formal sin of heresy, yet such, he said, may be judged and condemned "for sins not remisible without the true faith, and for want of virtues impracticable out of the communion of the Church." And he quoted St. Augustine as authority for the statement that Christian charity cannot be kept out of the unity of the Church. The Brothers Walenburch in their theological chapter on the excuses made for those in good faith in the heretical societies (*de excusationibus simpliciorum* among Protestants), considered in particular the excuse of those who say that they have been baptized, that they believe in Christ, that they apply themselves to good works, and therefore they may hope for salvation, although they adhere to the party divided from the Church. To which the Brothers Walenburch reply in the words of St. Augustine:

> We are accustomed from these words to show men that it avails them nothing to have either the Sacraments or the faith, if they have not charity, in order that, when you come to Catholic unity, you may understand what is conferred on you, and how great is that in which you were before deficient. *For Christian charity cannot be kept out of the unity of the Church;* and thus you may see that without it you are nothing, even though you have baptism and the faith, and by your faith are able to remove mountains. If this is also your opinion, let us not detest and scorn either the Sacraments which we acknowledge in you, or the faith itself, but let us maintain charity, without which we are nothing, even with the Sacraments and the faith. But we maintain charity, if we embrace unity; and we embrace unity when our knowledge is in unity through the words of Christ, not when through our own words we form a partial sketch.[7]

The reason for St. Augustine's statement that "Christian charity cannot be kept out of the unity of the Church" is no doubt contained in the words of the present Holy Father when speaking of those who, though not actual members, yet have the implicit desire of belonging to the Church. "Even though unsuspectingly they are related to the Mystical Body of the Redeemer in desire and resolution, they still remain deprived of so many precious gifts and helps from Heaven which one can enjoy only in the Catholic Church."[8]

---

[7] *Works,* V, 555.

Again, if the implicit desire of belonging to the Church is to be of any validity for salvation it must also be animated by supernatural faith. But to what extent the religious persuasion of those brought up in the sects can be dignified with the term supernatural faith is a question of some difficulty. True faith implies the absolute conviction of the truth of the divine revelation made by God and proposed by His Church. For the Catholic the Church is the infallible witness in the case. But where is the competent witness for what is really God's word for those outside the Church? Infallibility being disclaimed by all the sects, and the members of each being left to interpret what is called the Bible according to the principle of private interpretation, what is there to guarantee security against error, or to assure the individual that he has anything more than probable opinion? Any external authority competent to remove all doubt is plainly lacking. Hence Brownson always maintained that those outside the Church have nothing better than opinions in matters religious. "Even the Protestant laggards or old fogies," he said, "who adhere to the old Protestant confessions and formulas, adhere to them as opinions not as dogmas of faith. They, as well as the more advanced Protestants, speaks of differences among the sects, and between them and Catholics, as differences of opinion. This is the established phraseology of the journals, the best exponents, not indeed of truth, but of the spirit, views, and tendencies of their times and country."[9] While this line of thought points up the difficulty involved for a logical mind to arrive at that absolute certainty required for an act of divine faith, Brownson went too far if he held, as he seemed to hold, that an act of divine faith cannot at all be made out of the Church.[10] But that there is no little difficulty involved in the matter practically, is beyond doubt. After discussing the point, Archbishop Kenrick said in fine:

---

[8] *Mystici Corporis, AAS,* XXXV (1943), 243.

[9] As an example of doctrinal variations among Protestant sects, Dr. Karl Adam implies in his late book, *One and Holy* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1952), that if Luther were to come back today he would not be able to recognize among his followers what was his own original confession or formulas.

> We may be pardoned, therefore, for doubting whether in any instance the persuasion of sectaries can fairly be called faith. Their sincere attachment to the leading doctrines of Christianity we do not question; their pious dispositions and tendencies we do not doubt; but we fear they have not that deep and unshaken conviction which constitutes divine faith, and which is the result of the recognition of an infallible authority.[11]

As heresy is a sin against the virtue of faith, approaching this same question from a slightly different angle, Archbishop Kenrick asked the question: "Can faith exist where the authority of the Church and her doctrines are positively rejected?" In cases where the evidences have been sufficintly presented to challenge investigation, and move assent, the answer, he said, must plainly be in the negative:

> . . . but where the prejudices of education interfere, where the social position of the individual limits his opportunities of instruction, and where, nevertheless, a pious disposition is cherished, and the great mysteries of Christianity are devoutly believed, will the rejection of Catholic doctrines prove fatal? We feel our incompetency to pronounce judgment in a question which involves the consideration, not only of external means, but of the inward workings of divine grace; but we must say that the whole tenor of the divine economy is unfavorable to the supposition that faith can exist in such circumstances . . . To suppose that [God] moves to the belief of mysteries, whilst He leaves the mind unenlightened in regard to the authority by which they are proclaimed,—that He imparts pious dispositions for the exercise of Christian virtues, whilst He leaves unremoved a mass of prejudice against the Church which He has purchased with His blood,—is so much like making his operations clash with His institutions and putting Himself in opposition to Himself, that we cannot believe it . . .

---

[10] *Brownson's Q. Review* (1874), p. 222. Pius IX condemned as erroneous in his encyclical, *Quanto conficiamur moerore,* Aug. 10, 1863, the assertion that an act of faith cannot be made out of the Church.

[11] *Brownson's Q. Review,* 1853, p. 181.

We do not, however, rely on our own views in a matter of such moment; but look for guidance to the ancient Fathers, of whose general teaching St. Augustine is a competent witness. He maintains that heresy and schism are sins against the Holy Ghost, which are utterly irremisible, until divine grace, subduing the obduracy of the human heart, disposes it to seek pardon in unity. All the pretentions of the sects are utterly exploded by him, on the ground that to admit them would put Christ in opposition to Himself, and make the Holy Ghost an approver of revolt against authority divinely constituted. "Lest any one should imagine (says St. Augustine) that the kingdom of Christ is divided against itself on account of those who in the name of Christ form their conventicles out of the sheepfold, He says, 'He who is not with Me is against Me, and he who gathereth not with Me scattereth'; in order to show that they belong not to Him, who, gathering together out of the fold, gather not, but scatter. Then He added: 'Therefore I say unto you, every sin and blasphemy will be forgiven men: but the blasphemy of the Spirit shall not be forgiven.'—Here manifestly He forces us to understand, that the forgiveness of every sin and blasphemy cannot take place elsewhere than in the congregation of Christ, which does not scatter; for it is gathered in the Holy Ghost, who is not divided against Himself, as the unclean spirit is. Wherefore all congregations, or rather dispersions, which style themselves churches of Christ, and are divided and opposed to one another, and hostile to the congregation of unity which is His true Church, do not belong to His congregation, although they appear to bear His name."

This passage of St. Augustine, remarked Archbishop Kenrick, is particularly strong against the authors of schism, "but not without awful import in reference to all those whose misfortune it is to be numbered among their children. Although the sin may not be imputed to them, they bear its penality, by the mysterious dispensation of God, who visits the sins of parents on their children to the third and fourth generation. 'The truth rejects you all alike, good and bad,' says St. Augustine to the Manicheans."[12]

It should be noted further that the wording of the Aug. 8, 1949, Letter of the Holy Office indicates that the *implicit desire* of belonging to the Church is of such a nature that it supposes "a person involved in invincible ignorance." While those who are Catholics from infancy generally make the most liberal concessions about the so-called good faith of those out of the Church, Brownson evidently did not agree with those unreserved concessions. Whatever the worth of his convictions on the point, one would think that he should have known something whereof he spoke. He had been a Protestant minister for well-nigh twenty years, having been ordained for the Universalist ministry when he was twenty-three years of age, and having come into the Church only after he had entered on the forty-second year of his age. That there is much ignorance of the Church in those outside it in our country, Brownson knew as well as any one, but that it is to be dismissed in wholesale fashion as *invincible* ignorance (ignorance which might not be overcome), he plainly did not believe. But it was not till near the end of his life that he asserted rather pointedly that he did not believe there is much, if any, *invincible* ignorance of the Church among his Protestant countrymen. Speaking of the matter, he explained:

---

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 170 f.

> We do not believe that in our times there is much, if any, invincible ignorance among Protestant sects, or many instances of what is called good faith. Some such there undoubtedly are, for some such we find among converts to the Church; but we have no evidence that all such are not gathered into the one fold before they die, even though it be not till the last moment. We have many instances where persons brought up in the Protestant sects have learned, the grace of God assisting, the Catholic faith, and been led to the Church by a diligent reading of the Protestant mutilated edition and unfaithful version of the Scriptures. One very dear to us was so led: what hinders others in the same exterior circumstances, and possessing the same means, from being led in like manner? No reason can be assigned, but prejudice and the lack of interior dispositions. But that prejudice and that lack of interior disposition prevents one from seeking, *cauta solicitudine,* for the truth, as St. Augustine says, simply proves that they are not prepared to embrace the truth, when presented to them, disproves their good faith, and renders them guilty of the sin of unbelief. No member of an heretical sect is in good faith or inculpably ignorant, who does not seek with all the diligence and earnestness for the truth which a prudent man carries into his worldly affairs; at least so says the able and learned Thomist, Billuart . . .

The Church is a city set upon a hill, and her light shines out through all the region round, even to those in the valley. Her missionaries are in all nations, and there is not one in a Protestant nation that need remain ignorant of the Church or her titles, if he cares to know them, or is earnest to save his soul. The fact that persons from all ranks and conditions, learned and unlearned, freemen and slaves, have been converted, St. John Chrysostom urges, in one of his homilies, as a proof that all might, if they would.[13]

"The plea of invincible ignorance," said Archbishop Kenrick, "is not very complimentary to our fellow-citizens, who pride themselves on their superior knowledge and sagacity. We heard once of a pupil of the Irish National Schools, who was closely questioned by a Protestant gentleman, whose wealth and dullness entitled him to rank 'a fool of quality,' as to his chances of salvation, determined as he was to live and die a Protestant. The youth, with some embarrassment, replied, in a manner that mortified his examiner: 'Perhaps, Sir, you are in invincible ignorance.' " Archbishop Kenrick added that, after hearing a discourse on "saving ignorance" from a popular lecturer, a schoolmaster observed that ignorance is a strange road to Heaven.[14]

It is important to remember, too, when speaking of this matter, that even should ignorance be genuinely invincible it is in itself no passport to beatitude. Invincible ignorance is sometimes spoken of as if it were a positive virtue, whereas it is a negative quantity, and though it excuses from sin in that whereof one is invincibly ignorant, it has no positive virtue, and does not advance one a single step toward the Kingdom of Heaven. Being a negative quantity, it has no power to elevate the soul to the supernatural order, or place it on the plane of its supernatural destiny. That is why unbaptized infants dying in infancy can never see God in the Beatific Vision. Not even the absence of all personal sin, to say nothing of invincible ignorance, suffices to establish one in the supernatural order. For that an act of supernatural power is required. The reason for that is that the two orders, the natural and the supernatural, lie on radically different planes, and the supernatural can never be developed or evolved from the natural by any law of natural progress. "We are not placed by our birth from Adam on the plane of our beatitude, but to reach it must be born again, created anew in Christ Jesus; a new and higher life must be begotten in us, the life which flows out of the Incarnation, a life of which the Word made flesh is the author and fountain."[15]

---

[13] *Brownson's Q. Review,* 1874, p. 228; *Works,* XX, 401 f.

[14] *Brownson's Q. Review,* 1853, p. 175. A theologian who reviewed Father Gury's *Moral Theology in Brownson's Q. Review,* 1853, had this comment to make on invincible ignorance: "It is scarcely necessary to remark, that the plea of invincible ignorance, even if it excuse heresy in the abstract, fails to justify it in individual cases, simply because the first well-authenticated case of invincible ignorance as to the necessity of faith remains to be discovered. It never exists, says Gury, where the obligation of further inquiry is even in a confused and general way apprehended. The law which requires faith is sufficiently promulgated. Promulgation is the publication of the law made by legitimate authority, in order that all subjects may know the law and be bound by it. It would be absurd to argue that such publication has not taken place. And it is worthy of remark, that Protestants never plead invincible ignorance as an excuse for refusing to believe" (p. 69).

Neither could Brownson believe that the order of grace as established and revealed to us by God allows one to suppose that God leaves those who are invincibly ignorant of the Church to be saved just where they are. He always emphasized that the graces received by those outside the Church are given by God not only to assist them to lead godly lives but also to draw them to the unity of the Church. Bishop Hay, another convert, likewise strong in his maintenance that salvation is to be had only in the Church, expressed the like conviction that when God by His grace enlightens and moves persons out of the communion of the Church, if they are obedient to His impulses, they will be drawn finally within her pale.[16] "That God ever saves men by extraordinary means or without the *medium ordinarium,* is, as far as our knowledge goes," said Brownson, "authorized by no decision of the Church, by no *consensus theologorum,* by no analogy of faith, by no *ratio theologica,* and is expressly contradicted by the fourth council of the Lateran already cited."[17] Speaking at length of the matter, he affirmed:

> That there may be persons in heretical and schismatical societies, invincibly ignorant of the Church, who so perfectly correspond to the graces they reecive, that Almighty God will by *extraordinary means* bring them to the *Church,* is believable and perfectly compatible with the known order of grace, as is evinced by the case of the eunuch of Queen Canadace, that of Cornelius, the captain of the Italian band, and

---

[15] *Brownson's Q. Review,* 1874, p. 227.

[16] Cf. *Sincere Christian,* by Bishop Hay, pp. 345-90.

[17] *Works,* XX, 400.

> hundreds of others recorded by our missionaries, especially the missionaries of the Society of Jesus. In all instances of extraordinary or miraculous intervention of Almighty God, whether in the order of nature, or the order of grace, known to us, He has intervened *ad Ecclesiam,* and there is not a shadow of authority for supposing that He has ever miraculously intervened or ever will intervene otherwise. To assume that He will, under any circumstances, intervene to save men without the *medium ordinarium* is perfectly gratuitous, to say the least. To bring men in an extraordinary manner to the Church is easily admissible, because it does not dispense with the revealed economy of grace, nor imply its inadequacy; but to intervene to save men without it appears to us to dispense with it, and to imply that it is not adequate to the salvation of all whom God's goodness leads Him to save.
>
> That those in societies alien to the Church, invincibly ignorant of the Church, if they correspond with the graces they receive, and persevere, will be saved, we do not doubt, but not where they are, or without being brought to the Church. They are sheep, in the prescience of God Catholics, but sheep not yet gathered to the fold. "Other sheep I have" says Our Blessed Lord, "that are not of this fold; THEM ALSO I MUST BRING; THEY SHALL HEAR MY VOICE; and there shall be made one fold and one shepherd." This is conclusive; and that these must be brought, and enter the fold, which is the Church, in this life, St. Augustine expressly teaches in the words cited in the beginning of this note . . . Almighty God can be at no loss to save by the *medium ordinarium* all who are willing to be saved, and that, too, without contradicting Himself, departing from, or suspending the order of His grace; and, till better informed, we must believe it sounder theology to trust to His extraordinary grace to bring men to the Church than it is to invincible ignorance to save them out of it; "quia ipsa ignorantia in eis qui intelligere noluerunt, sine dubitatione peccatum est; in eis autem qui *non potuerunt,* poena peccati. Ergo in utrisque non est justa excusatio, sed justa damnatio." St. Augustine, Epist. ad Sixtum, Ed. Mar. 194, n. 27.[18]

It is in consonance with this theological reasoning that the Church charges her pastors by the tenure of their office to look to the cure of all souls within their parochial confines (Can. 464). Their pastoral care and solicitude is to go not only to the attending flock, but to the "other sheep" also. The singular success that some pastors have in this apostolic work is enough to awaken the consciences of us all as to what might be accomplished. A pastor who had been publicly commended by his bishop for the great number of converts he had brought into the Church was asked the secret of his success. "What method do you use?" "Whenever," he replied, "I get a convert from any family I always keep up contact with the family until I have brought them all into the Church." (He assumed it understood of course that prayer is the secret of secrets in winning converts, for faith is the free gift of God—"the Spirit breatheth where He will.") Another pastor who had eminent success in the same apostolic work replied to the same query: "I always announce on Sundays that public convert classes are being conducted each week and that all are cordially invited who might be in any way interested to learn something about the Church and her teaching." St. Augustine, addressing Anthony, a recent convert from Donatism, expressed his solicitude for the conversion of the other members of the family: "I desire and pray that your family likewise may have the one faith and true devotion, which is exclusively Catholic." Then, encouraging to zeal in this matter, he added: "There is scarcely any one who is solicitous for the salvation of his soul, and on that account intent on ascertaining the will of the Lord . . . who with the aid of a good guide will not discover the difference between any sect and the one Catholic Church."[19]

---

[18] *Ibid.,* V, 558 f. note.

It was for the various reasons expounded in the foregoing pages that Brownson viewed with alarm the position of those not in the visible communion of the Church. In his repeated discussions of the dogma *extra ecclesiam nulla salus,* he was always trying to make Catholics more conscious of the solemn duty imposed upon them by Christian charity to do all they can to bring others into the Church. It was his genuine love for his non-Catholic countrymen that made him so solicitous for their spiritual safety. "There is no sacrifice in my power," he said, "that I would not make to bring 'my kinsmen after the flesh' to Christ."[20] There is a wide difference, Brownson often asserted, between liberality and Christian charity. No doubt he as well as any one else who has a heart would have rejoiced to declare the gates of Heaven wide open to all mankind, but what if in making such a declaration he were only deceiving others most cruelly? He thought no more fatal mistake could be made when speaking of this dogma than to give those outside the Church the impression that they need not be disturbed about where they are. He cautioned against this tendency in a remarkable paragraph that is worth quoting in conclusion:

---

[19] *Ep.* XX.

[20] *Works,* XX, 383.

> But, if it be true, and as sure as God exists and can neither be deceived nor deceive, it is true, that there is no salvation out of the Church, what a fearful responsibility should we not incur, were we to forbear to proclaim it, or, by our mistimed or misplaced qualifications, to encourage the unbelieving, the heretical, or the indifferent to hope to the contrary! And how much more fearful still, if we should go further, and attempt in our publications to prove that he who firmly insists on it is harsh, unjust, uncharitable, running in rash zeal to an unauthorized extreme! No doubt, the truth is always and everywhere to be adhered to, let the consequences be what they may; no doubt, he who errs by his rigor is to be rebuked, as well as he who errs by his laxity; but if, in our zeal to rebuke imaginary rigor, we should compel the missionary to prove the necessity of his Church against his own friends before he could be at liberty to assert it against infidels and heretics, if we run before him and intercept his arrows winged at the sinner's conscience, or follow immediately after and bind up and assuage the wounds they may have inflicted, our zeal would but indifferently atone for the good we hinder, or the scandal we cause. These poor souls, for whom our Lord shed his precious blood, for whom bleed afresh the dear wounds in His hands, His feet, His side, bound in chains of error and sin, suspended over the precipice, ready to drop into the abyss below, admonish all who have hearts of flesh, or bowels of compassion, to speak out, to cry aloud in awful and piercing tones to warn them of their danger, rather than by ingenious distinctions or qualifications to flatter them, or to have the appearance of flattering them, with the hope that, after all, their condition is not perilous.[21]

THOMAS R. RYAN, C.PP.S.

Precious Blood Mission House
New Cumberland, Pa.

---

[21] *Ibid.*, V, 551 f.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE HOLY SHROUD

PART III

THE CRUCIFIXION

Dr. Hynek insists over and over again that the body of one crucified was suspended entirely from the arms without support of any kind. The foot-rest, it is true, may be ruled out, for there seems to be no historical warrant for its use. The Shroud, too, indicates that the feet were nailed directly to the upright without the sloping support adopted by artists. Dr. Hynek, however, also rules out the *sedile,* a projection in the middle of the upright upon which the crucified could rest, whereas it can hardly be denied that such a support was a customary part of the cross. In describing the cross, three of our earliest witnesses—Justin, Irenaeus and Tertullian—speak of the middle projection, calling it a seat and a horn. And there is the phrase common among ancient writers: *in cruce equitare,* to sit astride on the cross.

Perhaps this does not definitely settle the question so far as the cross of Christ is concerned. Perhaps, too, if there was such a projection in His case, there should be traces of it in the imprints. But Dr. Hynek denies that such a support ever existed and insists that the body of Christ was suspended by the arms alone, not on any historical or scriptural authority, but only because he considers this essential to his theory of the cause of the death of Christ. He defeats his own purpose, however, as will be seen below. In the absence of a foot-rest, this very theory demands some support like the middle projection.

Dr. Hynek also supposes that, after the death of Christ, the chin rested on the chest, closing the mouth and stiffening in that position (pp. 40, 51, 85). When he takes up the question of the burial, he offers this as proof that there was no need of a chin-band. Moreover, he claims that this is confirmed by an experiment performed by Dr. Barbet, who crucified a human corpse which was perfectly pliable. Of this experiment Dr. Hynek writes: "the head hung forward by its own weight, with the chin touching the chest so that the mouth shut of its own accord and remained shut" (p. 51). This is not correct. The head hung forward just slightly, leaving the chin free.[60]

THE WOUND IN THE SIDE

Dr. Hynek says it was a common practice of the Romans to terminate the torments of the crucified by piercing the side with a spear (pp. 55, 66). He states this as if it were a well-established fact, whereas all the known evidence points the other way. He thereby surrenders an important mark of the identity of the Man of the Shroud who, like Christ, was pierced through the side while still suspended on the cross.

Dr. Vignon reviewed all the historical references that might have any bearing on the question.[61] In the end, he found only one case that might be said to have some resemblance to that of Christ. The crucified martyrs Marcus and Marcellinus were dispatched with a spear, but only because they persisted in raising their voice in thanksgiving to Christ. In other words, it was a chance occurrence in their particular case, not in any way an indication of a common practice thus to hasten the death of the crucified.

---

[60] *Pierre Barbet, Les cinq plaies du Christ. Etude anatomique et expérimentale* (Issoudun: Dillen et Cie, 4th ed., 1937), two photos facing p. 63.

[61] *Op. cit.*, pp. 195-96. Origen is cited as testifying that it was Roman custom to dispatch the crucified with a spear (*Series veteris interpretationis commentariorum Origenis in Matthaeum,* n. 140 [*MPG,* XIII, 1793]), but can the work in question, or at least the passage cited, be ascribed to Origen? It is a mediaeval Latin text of a commentary on the second half of the Gospel of Matthew. The Greek text of this part of Origen's commentary is lost, but there is reason to believe that the translator took liberties with the Greek text. His style differs from that of Origen in his commentary on the first half of Matthew, the Greek text of which has been preserved, and there may be interpolations. In the passage cited above, for example, it is implied that a Roman official had the choice of letting the crucified die of their torments, or of ordering them to be dispatched with a stroke of the spear "under the shoulders" *(sub alas)*. Origen could hardly have written that, for it was contrary to Roman law and practice to grant such a choice to any official. Once crucified, the condemned had to die on the cross of the torments of crucifixion—that was Roman law and practice. An exception was made in Palestine, where the Mosaic Law prescribed that a criminal be buried before nightfall on the day of his execution, but the mode of dispatching the crucified in such a case was to break their legs, not to drive a spear "under the shoulders."

The case of Christ was different and still more exceptional. The soldiers came to Calvary to break the legs of the three crucified. This, and not the piercing of the side, was the customary mode of hastening death when the crucified were to be taken down from the cross before succumbing to their torments. But Christ was already dead, and St. John states explicitly that the soldiers saw that He was dead (*John* 19:33). He states this with peculiar emphasis, for it was most unusual for one to die so quickly on the cross. The soldiers, therefore, did not break the legs of Christ, but one of them opened His side with a lance. That violent thrust may have been a wanton impulse, a gesture of contempt, an effort to make doubly sure of Christ's death—anything but an act in accord with established practice. It was an accident of the moment under the most extraordinary circumstances, and it sets the case of Christ apart by itself as unique in the history of crucifixion. The imprint of His open side can still be seen on the Shroud.

THE BLOOD AND WATER

It is agreed among the medical men who have studied the Shroud that the issue from the wound in the side has the appearance of post-mortem bleeding and something else besides—thick blood accompanied by a thin watery fluid. This is another mark of identity because it agrees with the Gospels in another unique detail. According to the narrative of the Evangelists, it may have been about an hour after death that the side of Christ was pierced. The eye-witness St. John relates that immediately there came forth blood and water (*John* 19:34).

The Shroud reveals even more than is related in the Gospels. In the dorsal image there are two meandering streams that extend across the imprint of the loins. These have still more clearly the appearance of semi-fluid blood and some sort of organic liquid. Here, in fact, the blood seems to be partly clotted. The two streams were a second flow from the wound in the side, issuing from below the level of the wound when the body was laid on the Shroud. This occurred close to three hours after the death of Christ.

Dr. Hynek is probably mistaken in saying that this second issue flowed on the under surface of the body. It seems much more likely that it flowed on the Shroud itself under the arched loins. This offers no real difficulty in view of the fact that this was a new sheet of unbleached linen, woven in a compact twill design. It must also have been somewhat stiff, like the replica of the fabric of the Shroud attached to p. 55 of Timossi's book. The irregular flow in two winding streams could easily have been caused by an unevenness of the cloth.

Dr. Hynek is certainly mistaken in saying that the second issue from the lance wound flowed from one side to the other "while the body was being wound in linen strips and laid in the Shroud" (p. 75). How is one to picture the operation of laying the body in the Shroud while it is being wound in linen strips? However that may be, the blood and water surely could not have remained as we now see them on the Shroud—undisturbed and still so exact as to amaze the medical investigators. The truth is that there could have been no winding of the body in linen strips. Not only would this have wrought havoc with the flow of blood and water, it would also have rendered impossible the formation of the two images, which are practically an undistorted reflection of the body—anatomically correct and bearing details so precise as to defy the microscope and the photographic enlarger.

Speculation on secondary aspects should not be allowed to obscure the fact that the Shroud retains the traces of the issue of blood and water from the side of Christ, thereby offering visible proof that He really died on the cross. It confirms this momentous fact still more surely by showing that there was a post-mortem bleeding also from the right foot, and that the body evidently grew rigid while still nailed to the cross.

All this valuable evidence must be carefully distinguished from two problems that have baffled scriptural commentators from the beginning: whence did the blood and water come? and what precisely was the water? Dr. Hynek asserts that both these problems have been solved by the Shroud. What he really means is that he regards a certain explanation as the true one—that of Dr. Barbet as modified by Dr. Judica. But this is a theory which other physicians and pathologists do not accept, and there are other explanations which seem to have a certain amount of authority. In the end, any solution that may be offered must be judged from a strictly medical point of view without involving the Shroud in a question that it cannot solve.

THE BURIAL

Dr. Hynek's treatment of this question is particularly unfortunate. He ventures into the field of exegesis in an attempt to show that the Shroud with its imprints is in accord with the Gospel account of the burial of Christ. Instead, he distorts the meaning of the sacred text and surrenders the impregnable position of the Shroud, rendering himself logically incapable of affirming its authenticity. A brief statement of the problem and of Dr. Hynek's position will make this clear.

In recent years the attack against the Shroud has been based principally upon the biblical texts that describe the burial of Christ. According to these texts, say the opponents, the body of Christ was washed and anointed, the face covered with a napkin, the linen sheet bound about the body with swathing-bands. Under these conditions, of course, there could have been no imprints of the body on the winding-sheet like those on the Shroud of Turin. I dealt with this objection at the sindonological congress held in Rome.[62] Before that I treated the whole question of the burial in two articles to which I refer the reader for an ample documentation.[63]

From all four Evangelists it is clear that the burial was performed in haste within the little time available before the beginning of the Sabbath. With regard to the manner of the burial, the Synoptics offer no difficulty at all. They simply state that the body was wrapped in the linen sheet and laid in the tomb. Beyond that, they imply that the body was not anointed, relating that the women prepared ointments after the burial and went to the tomb on Sunday morning to anoint the Lord. The washing of the body is also to be excluded because of certain ritual requirements which could not have been fulfilled in the unforeseen emergency on Calvary.

---

[62] Edward A. Wuenschel, "La Santa Sindone di Torino e la sepoltura di Cristo," *La Santa Sindone nelle ricerche moderne* (1951), pp. 32-33. On the basis of this very brief and inadequate summary, Father Zaehringer *(Benediktinische Monatschrift,* XXVII [1951], 228) concludes that I failed to prove that the burial of Christ was provisional, without washing or anointing, without a napkin covering the face, without binding of the body with swathing-bands. I would suggest that he await the complete text. Meanwhile, I would invite him to read the two articles to be cited in the next note. He may then realize that it is not sufficient simply to repeat what P. Braun and Daniel-Rops have written, or to quote fragments from the Talmud without attempting to estimate their historical value. If the opponents were to divest themselves of certain preconceived notions and follow a truly objective, historical method, they might be surprised to find how difficult it is to justify their own reconstruction of the burial of Christ. I would make the same recommendations to Rev. Eugene Dabrowski ("Sprawa Calunu Turynskiego," *Znak miesiecznik,* IV [1950], 309-21, who seems to have been very poorly informed as to what I really said in my lecture at the congress in Rome.

[63] Edward A. Wuenschel, "The Shroud of Turin and the Burial of Christ," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* VII (1945), 135-78.

The text of John is more detailed, and it is interpreted by the opponents as meaning that the body of Christ was bound with linen bands, and that the *sudarium* which was "upon his head" was a napkin covering the face. They overlook the phrase which is really the key to the whole problem. The body was wrapped in linen cloths, says John (19:40), "according to the custom of the Jews in preparing the dead for burial." Was it Jewish custom in the time of Christ to bind the dead with swathing-bands after the manner of a mummy? And was the face of the dead covered with a napkin? Not one of the opponents has investigated these questions, which can be decided only by reliable historical authority.

All the historical sources which refer to the Jewish manner of clothing the dead at the beginning of the Christian era or in earlier times speak only of envelopment of the body in a shroud or in ordinary garments. Never is there any allusion to binding with swathing-bands, which would have been an anomaly in the Jewish manner of burial.

As a general practice, the covering of the face was introduced later. In the time of Christ it was done only under certain circumstances which were not present in His case. The *sudarium* may have been the winding-sheet folded over the head, or a chin-band, which is known to have been in use among the ancient Jews. It could not have been a napkin covering the face.

On the basis of the sacred text, therefore, we have good reason to conclude, indeed we are compelled to conclude, that the customary burial rites were deferred because of exceptional circumstances. It was a hasty, provisional burial, with which the imprints on the Shroud of Turin agree in all respects. So far, then, from being an insuperable difficulty, the Gospel account of the burial provides another cogent argument for the identity of the Man of the Shroud.

Now for Dr. Hynek's interpretation (pp. 79-91). He holds rightly that the body was not washed or anointed. He is right also in saying, with practically all commentators, that the mixture of myrrh and aloes mentioned by John was a dry powder. But then these powdered spices suddenly become ointments, containing "various kinds of resins, which were dissolved in aromatic essence to make the mixture more liquid and easier to handle" (p. 90). Somehow there is also oil of turpentine, containing pinene, which by oxidation turns resinous, "and after a considerable time a semi-solid mass results, which later solidifies . . . these products also affected the pure linen of the Shroud" (p. 91).

Moreover, according to Dr. Hynek, the body was bound in the winding-sheet with linen bands. But this was not all. There was also the myrrh—"a resin which stiffens when mixed with unguents" (p. 83). So the winding-sheet was secured with the linen strips stiffened with myrrh and unguents, which indeed stiffened so well that, when Peter came to the tomb, "he saw the Shroud lying on the stone, still preserving the outline of Christ's body. The ointment of myrrh, stiffening on the linen bands, caused them to keep the shape of the body they had wrapped" (p. 88).

Apparently a handkerchief was laid over Our Lord's face, as illustrated by an experiment of Dr. Judica. "The imprints," says Dr. Hynek, "were formed not only on the handkerchief but also, through it, on the Shroud itself" (p. 96).

Is it too much to say that this description of the burial of Christ is fantastic? Let it pass in silence and read the Evangelists.

As for the Shroud, just look at the photos. Note the mistlike, evanescent stain forming a complete, undistorted image of the front and the back of the body. Note the realistic marks of fresh wounds, some of them with traces of a serous exudation. Note the precise transfers of blood, exactly as it had flowed and clotted on the surface of the body and still portraying the separation of clot and serum. Compare the positive and the negative photos, and realize that the noble, imposing figure standing out against the black background like a statue sculptured by a supreme master, is latent in the form of a negative in the stains on the Shroud. Then ask yourself: could these two incomparable images, surpassing anything ever created by art, have been conceivably produced with such a crude accumulation of volatile essences, viscid unguents, solidified resins and rigid, form-fitting wrappings?

As for the imprint of the face being produced on the Shroud through a handkerchief—whatever may have been the result of Dr. Judica's experiment, certainly nothing of the kind took place in the case of the Shroud. There is blood there in solid mass. It had already clotted on the brow and the hair and was transferred directly to the cloth. It could not have passed through another cloth, for this would have strained out the clotted blood and left at most a dull stain on the Shroud.

One final point. Dr. Hynek reminds his readers: "I have already made it clear that any kind of chin-cloth to close the mouth was unnecessary, and that none was used" (p. 85). He has already made this clear by assuming that the chin rested on the chest while the dead body remained on the cross. We saw above that this supposition is disproved by the very experiment to which Dr. Hynek appeals. The mouth was very probably bound up with a chin-band, and this offers a reasonable explanation of the interruption of the imprint at the top of the head.

According to Dr. Hynek, this vacant space "could only have been caused by heaps of aromatics inserted inside the stretched linen and separating the two sets of impressions from each other" (p. 83). It is hard to picture heaps of powdered spices inserted inside the stretched linen in the form of the vacant space on the Shroud. Had the aromatics been there in contact with the cloth, there would have been no vacant space, since the aromatics themselves were an active agent in the production of the imprints.

I repeat, so long as Dr. Hynek maintains his concept of the burial of Christ, he cannot consistently affirm the authenticity of the Shroud of Turin.

THE GENESIS OF THE IMPRINTS

The authenticity of the Shroud is entirely independent of the question: by what process were the two stain images produced? Some of the defenders of the Shroud have exaggerated the importance of this question, while opponents have imagined that the authenticity of the Shroud must stand or fall with any solution that may be offered. Even if there were no satisfactory explanation, this would not in the least impair the evidence which proves that the Shroud bears the imprints of Christ. Quite naturally, however, students of the Shroud have sought a solution.

In 1902 Yves Delage presented, before the French Academy of Sciences, the vaporograph theory worked out by Vignon with the aid of Delage himself and René Colson. Ammonia vapors released from the sweat—so the theory runs—re-acted with an element in the aloes and produced the reddish brown stain—the stain being graduated according to the contours of the body and the varying distance of the cloth from the surface. It was thus that Vignon accounted for the negative characteristics of the two images. As a matter of fact, on the Shroud the stain is dark where the cloth was in contact with the reliefs of the body, whereas it fades away at the receding planes of the cavities and the rounded sides where there could have been no contact.

After seeing the Shroud in 1931 and making new experiments, Vignon re-affirmed his theory. At the same time he pointed out the difficulties that it involves and declared that it is only a partial explanation. This refers to the genesis of the stain images. There are other enigmatical features of the imprints which are beyond the scope of the vaporograph theory. Altogether, says Vignon, the imprints on the Shroud remain in many respects a scientific mystery.

At the national sindonological congress held in Turin in 1939, Dr. Giovanni Judica-Cordiglia, Professor of Legal Medicine at the University of Milan, proposed an entirely different theory, which caused a great stir because of its novelty and the fact that it was based on experiments performed with human corpses.[64] Assuming that the Shroud had been saturated with a solution of turpentine and olive oil, which caused it to adhere to the body like a wet gown, Dr. Judica ascribed the imprints to direct contact

---

[64] Giovanni Judica Cordiglia, "Ricerche ed esperienze sulla genesi delle impronte della S. Sindone," *La Santa Sindone nelle ricerche moderne* (1950), pp. 37-49; *L'uomo della Sindone è il Cristo?* (Milano: Libreria Pontificia Arcivescovile, 1941), pp. 15-33, 107-23. In a lecture at the Roman congress, Dr. Judica's theory remains substantially unaltered ("Ipotesi e nuovi esperimenti sulla genesi delle impronte sulla S. Sindone," *La Santa Sindone nelle ricerche moderne* [1951] pp. 23-25).

—the stain, according to him, being produced by a re-action of the myrrh and aloes with the turpentine.

Like many others, Dr. Hynek accepts this theory as the true explanation of the imprints on the Shroud, and declares it to be a complete refutation of the vaporograph theory. Unfortunately, it is all too clear that he understands neither the one nor the other. He seriously misrepresents Vignon's theory and gives an inaccurate account of Dr. Judica's. In different parts of his book he mixes elements of both theories in contradictory fashion. Above all, he does not realize that Dr. Judica's theory has no chance of explaining how the imprints on the Shroud were produced.

Dr. Judica notes that any attempt at a solution must be in accord with the condition of the body of Christ in the tomb, and that this demands a correct reconstruction of the burial. Strangely enough, however, he himself accepts an interpretation of the Gospel account which was put forward by Père F. M. Braun, O. P., in a determined attack against the authenticity of the Shroud.[65] Dr. Judica modifies P. Braun's interpretation in some respects, but he accepts in substance the idea that the burial of Christ was definitive, with the observance of all the customary rites.

According to Dr. Judica, the body was washed at least summarily. The mixture of myrrh and aloes was copiously strewn over the body and thoroughly dried the wounds. The face was covered with a thin veil. The body, wrapped in the winding-sheet, was bound with linen bands at the neck, the waist, the knees and the feet. A solution of turpentine and olive oil was poured over the burial linens and caused the winding-sheet to cling about the body. When Peter entered the tomb on Sunday morning, he saw the winding-sheet lying in its place and retaining the form of the body as if it were a mummy.

This reconstruction of the burial of Christ does not seem to be any better than Dr. Hynek's. It is decidedly at variance with the Gospels and the Jewish practice of the time. Here, then, is a fatal flaw in Dr. Judica's whole theory. He builds on a false foundation, and at the very outset eliminates the possibility of explaining the imprints on the Shroud. More than that, his theory is in contradiction with the imprints in almost every respect. Here are the principal points.

---

[65] F. M. Braun, "Le Linceul de Turin et l'Evangile de Saint Jean," *Nouvelle revue théologique*, LXVI (1939), 900-35, 1025-46.

The body that caused the imprints was not washed, not even summarily, otherwise the blood and serum would have been removed, or at least badly smeared.

Neither was the body copiously strewn with powdered spices. Had these covered the body in great quantity, they would have prevented many of the fine details of the images. There certainly could not have been the impressions of fresh wounds, the precise transfers of blood, the traces of serum or of the copious flow from the wound in the side.

If the Shroud had been saturated with oil, these details would have been prevented all the more surely. Moreover, the oil would have combined with the spices and the blood and would have formed a paste which, after drying, would have adhered tenaciously to the cloth, as Dr. Judica found in some of his experiments. He also observed that the adhesive mass dissolved under the action of water vapor, leaving a halo around a central nucleus. Nothing like this, of course, is to be seen on the Shroud.

As already pointed out, the face could not have been covered with a veil, for this would have prevented the direct transfer of clotted blood from the brow and the hair, supposing that there was still blood there after the alleged washing.

The Shroud certainly did not cling closely about the whole body, otherwise there would be an imprint of the sides as well as of the front and the back, and we would have a stain equal in width to the circumference of the body. Insofar as there would be any image of the body, it would necessarily be very much distorted. On the Shroud there is an imprint only of the frontal and the dorsal planes of the body, and the two figures are almost as free from distortion as an image reflected in a mirror.

All these features of the imprints exclude Dr. Judica's theory of contact in the manner described. The rest of the theory and Dr. Judica's method of procedure are irrelevant. The chemical reaction between turpentine and the aromatics, and the attempt to account for the color of the imprints by the re-action of blood with the mixure aloes-myrrh-turpentine, can tell us nothing useful regarding the Shroud.

Equally irrelevant is the fact that Dr. Judica experimented with human corpses. These were in no condition analogous to that of the body of Christ, prepared as they were in accordance with an erroneous conception of the burial. Of themselves, the corpses contributed nothing to the result, except to supply a figure with reliefs. The same could have been done just as well with a statue. M. Clement, in fact, performed a similar experiment with a marble bust and obtained a comparable result.[66]

Dr. Judica, it is true, obtained negative images of human faces by his process (he does not reproduce any imprint obtained from a whole body)—rather rudimentary and expressionless, but still negatives, though they needed subsequent treatment with water vapor to tone down the sharp contrasts and to give the stain some degree of shading. But this is all beside the point. Produced by such a process, under such conditions, and with such materials, how can Dr. Judica's negatives illustrate the genesis of the imprints on the Shroud? These are not any kind of negatives produced by any kind of process. Whatever part the spices may have played, these imprints were produced by some subtle emanation from the body itself, and they form a genuine portrait in reverse, with that noble, sorrowful countenance latent in the stains, along with those two perfectly moulded figures in which we can read every phase of the drama of Calvary.

Dr. Hynek does a poor service to the cause of the Shroud in proclaiming Dr. Judica's theory as the definitive explanation of the imprints, and as a complete refutation of the vaporograph theory. With all its difficulties and defects, Vignon's theory remains the only one that may be regarded as a probable and approximate explanation. As Vignon himself insists, this leaves the imprints to a great extent a scientific mystery.

THE CAUSE OF CHRIST'S DEATH

What was the immediate physical cause of the death of Christ? This question was not considered in connection with the Shroud till about fifteen years ago, when Dr. Hynek proposed a theory which he claimed to be visibly portrayed by the imprints. His theory is that Christ died of asphyxia, brought about by acute cramps of the muscles of the respiratory system, as a result of prolonged suspension on the cross. This theory he features in all his writings on the Shroud as a momentous discovery of his own, and he claims that it is scientifically demonstrated. He still maintains it in his latest book (pp. 56-65) without any hint to the reader that serious objections have been made, and that other medical men reject his theory.

---

[66] F. M. Braun, *op. cit.*, note complémentaire, *ibid.*, LXVII (1940), pp. 322-24, fig. 1, 2.

How cautious and reserved pathologists often are in pronouncing judgment as to the cause of death in a particular case even when they have been able to perform an autopsy! Dr. Hynek attempts to solve the delicate problem of the cause of the death of Christ from a set of rather faint imprints produced nineteen centuries ago. The fact is that he exaggerates certain details and makes extravagant claims that go far beyond anything that the imprints can reveal.

The problem must be investigated according to different criteria. Above all, there must first be a careful study of the Gospels, the only historical record that we have, in order to determine as accurately as possible the circumstances of the death of Christ. No theory of the cause of His death is worthy of consideration unless it be in accord with these circumstances. On this basis, I have consulted many medical men about Dr. Hynek's theory. They were all extremely skeptical, if not decidedly opposed.

In 1937 I submitted six objections to Dr. Hynek himself in a manuscript which had been read and endorsed by four practicing physicians and two pathologists. In April, 1950, shortly before the sindonological congress in Rome, I reminded Dr. Hynek that he had not yet answered these objections. He was not able to attend the congress,[67] and the objections still remain unanswered.

---

[67] There seems to be something wrong with the final paragraph of Dr. Hynek's present book, perhaps an error of translation. He was not present at the congress in Rome, yet he states that he delivered a special lecture at the congress—one based on twenty-five proofs, mostly of a medical nature—and that the congress approved the lecture. The congress as such neither approved nor disapproved any of the lectures delivered. In Dr. Hynek's absence, a lecture prepared by him was read by another. The subject of this lecture was "The true cause of the death of the crucified and post-mortem rigidity" *(La Santa Sindone nelle ricerche moderne* [1951], pp. 26-27)—a repetition of Dr. Hynek's well-known views. He was scheduled to give another lecture apart from the sessions of the congress on "The problem

Meanwhile the whole question was placed in a new light, and the objections to Dr. Hynek's theory were rendered still more cogent, by the results of experiments conducted by Dr. Herman Moedder of Cologne, who presented his findings at the congress in Rome.[68] Briefly, the case is as follows.

A preliminary objection is that Dr. Hynek follows a wrong method of inquiry. He pays little attention to the Gospels and strives to determine the cause of death by crucifixion in general. This he assumes to be asphyxia due to muscular constriction of the respiratory system, and he concludes that the same cause must have brought about the death of Christ. Even if his premise were correct (it seems now to be refuted by Dr. Moedder's experiments), the conclusion would not follow. The manner of Christ's death was strikingly different from the way in which the crucified ordinarily died. It must, therefore, be considered by itself if there is to be any prospect of determining the cause of death in this one exceptional case.

The second objection concerns the duration of the agony of Christ on the cross.

One of the most horrible aspects of crucifixion was the fact that it lasted so long. At least a full day seems to have been common. Two or three days were not unusual. Christ died after three hours—such an exceptionally short lapse of time that Pilate was

---

of the Shroud solved by medico-legal studies." Dr. Barbet substituted for him with an illustrated lecture of his own. The twenty-five proofs to which Dr. Hynek refers were not presented in any lecture, but on a mimeographed sheet which he mailed to many persons attending the congress. I have it before me at the moment. Rather than a series of proofs, it is a list of brief propositions which amounts to an index of Dr. Hynek's writings on the Shroud. Still less was this approved by the congress.

[68] Hermann Moedder, "La causa di morte nella crocifissione in alcuni esperimenti," *La Santa Sindone nelle ricerche moderne* (1951), pp. 28-31. Dr. Moedder had already presented his findings in three articles: "Die Todesursache bei der Kreuzigung," *Stimmen der Zeit,* LXXIV (1949), 50-59; "Die neueste medizinische Forschung ueber die Todesursache bei der Kreuzigung Jesu Christi," *Der Gottesfreund,* III (1950), 40-46; "Der elidende Christus," *K D A, Blaetter der Katholischen Deutschen Akademikerschaft,* I (1950), 12-17. For a professional Evaluation of Dr. Moedder's work, see Engelbert Sons, "Die Todesursache bei der Kreuzigung," *Stimmen der Zeit,* LXXV (1950), 60-64; Heinz Zimmermann, "Der Tod am Kreuz," *Hochland,* LXI (1949), 614-16.

astounded when told that Christ was already dead. It seemed so unlikely that he called the centurion from Calvary to verify the death.

At first the objection against Dr. Hynek's theory was that he could not account for the fact that Christ died so quickly. Now it seems rather that he cannot explain how Christ endured so long. He maintains that Christ was suspended by the arms fully outstretched, without any support like a foot-rest or a projection at the middle of the upright.[69] In Dr. Moedder's experiments robust, athletic young men, fresh and well rested, were suspended from an iron rod with the hands only one meter apart—a considerable mitigation. After only a few minutes there were serious functional disturbances, especially in the action of the heart and the circulation of the blood. Some of the subjects were able to endure the experiment for an hour if they alternated between hanging by the hands for three minutes and standing for three minutes.[70] After six minutes of continuous suspension most of them were overcome by unconsciousness in the condition called "orthostatic collapse," due to an insufficient supply of blood to the brain and the heart. The most that even the strongest could endure till they lapsed into unconsciousness was twelve minutes.

Orthostatic collapse is not death, but death would have resulted rather quickly if the suspension had not been terminated. How quickly, could not, of course, be determined, but the experiments prove this much: under the conditions postulated by Dr. Hynek—free suspension by the arms fully outstretched—a crucified person would have died long before three hours had elapsed.

The process, too, would have been quite different from asphyxia through cramps of the breathing muscles. Dr. Moedder reports that there were no cramps even of the muscles of the arms that sustained the weight of the body. The breathing became rapid and shallow, but this was because of the permanent distention of the thorax, which hindered the action of the costal muscles. Towards the end of each experiment, the breathing was almost entirely diaphragmatic. The vital capacity[71] was notably reduced, but it was far from threatening suffocation. It is particularly noteworthy that there was no tendency to any cramp of the diaphragm, whereas Dr. Hynek supposes an acute cramp of this central breathing muscle to have been the decisive factor in causing the death of the crucified by asphyxia. On the other hand, the supply of blood to the brain and the heart decreased rapidly. This and not asphyxia, says Dr. Moedder, would be the cause of death in the case where free suspension by the arms is allowed to continue without relief.

---

[69] Dr. Barbet has shown that under these conditions the traction would be such that each arm would have to sustain, not merely half the weight of the body, but more than the equivalent of the whole weight (*op. cit.*, p. 24).

[70] In his article in *Stimmen der Zeit* (p. 54) Dr. Moedder says that, with alternations between hanging and standing for three minutes, the experiments could be endured for only half an hour. In this article, as in his lecture at the congress, he states that these experiments had to be broken off because the bindings of the hands interfered too much with the circulation.

Dr. Moedder and other physicians consider that Dr. Hynek's theory as to the cause of the death of the crucified is definitely refuted. Apart from the process, the time factor alone is a conclusive argument against it, in the case of Christ as well as of the crucified in general.

Third, Christ spoke His last words and cried out with a loud voice immediately before His death. This would have been impossible in Dr. Hynek's theory, according to which the whole respiratory and vocal system would have been completely paralyzed by the final fatal constriction of the breathing muscles, especially of the diaphragm. Dr. Moedder reports that neither he nor any of his collaborators was able to utter a loud cry in the last moments before collapse, though their mode of suspension was less taxing than the manner of crucifixion assumed by Dr. Hynek, and orthostatic collapse is not the same as death.

Fourth, Christ was fully conscious to the very end. Dr. Moedder's experiments show that the free suspension supposed by Dr. Hynek would have caused unconsciousness very quickly.

Fifth, the death of Christ was sudden—an abrupt ending of life immediately after He had cried out with a loud voice. Such a death could not have been caused by asphyxia resulting from progressive constriction of the respiratory muscles. This is a gradual process and it would bring on death slowly, not with a sudden shock. It would be similar to the case of one who suffocates from the effects of poison gas, or from having his supply of air shut off externally. In Dr. Moedder's experiments the functional disturbances were progressive, the subjects gradually lapsed into unconsciousness, and if the suspension had not been terminated death would have resulted after a further lapse of time.

---

[71] Vital capacity is that quantity of air in the lungs, measured in litres, which can be exhaled after a full inhalation.

Finally, like most physicians and pathologists who have dealt with the problem, Dr. Hynek considers only the bodily sufferings of Christ, as if the sacrifice of the Saviour were a purely physical process. There was another factor of primary importance—His agony of mind. Along with the crucifixion of the body, there was an interior crucifixion of the spirit—the sorrow, the outraged love, the mysterious sense of dereliction, that transfixed the Victim laden with the sins of the world. That piercing mental agony, penetrating the depths of the soul, must have had its reaction in the body—all the more profoundly because the physical conditions induced by crucifixion must have made the whole organism more susceptible to the impact of the inner spiritual crisis.

The agony in the Garden of Olives gripped and wrenched the body of Christ so as to produce a sweat of blood. It might have been mortal had not the consoling angel brought relief. "My soul is sorrowful even unto death," said Christ as He entered upon this agony. What, then, are we to say of the agony that harrowed His soul while He was actually accomplishing His atoning sacrifice on the cross? May not this be the key to the whole problem? May it not, perhaps, enable us at least to divine how Christ died, and why He died in such an exceptional manner? At any rate, an inquiry into the immediate cause of His death is superficial and inadequate if one disregards His mental sufferings.

These are the six objections that I proposed to Dr. Hynek. The medical men whom I consulted and Drs. Moedder, Sons, Zimmermann, Pototschnig,[72] Marigo,[73] and Schmittlein,[74] made other objections of a more technical nature, but these six will suffice to show how far Dr. Hynek is from solving so delicate and complicated a problem.

---

[72] Georgio Pototschnig, "*La S. Sindone vista da un medico*" (Firenze, 1948), pp. 14-16. This is a reprint of an article in *Città di Vita,* III (1948), n. 6.

[73] Sergio Marigo, "Le cause di morte in Cristo," *Studium,* XLVI (1950), 345-65.

[74] Raymond Schmittlein, *Circonstances et cause de la mort du Christ* (Bade: Editions Art et Science, 1950), pp. 29-30, 79-81.

* * * * *

It is with deep regret that one sees *The True Likeness* appear in English. Readers will be grossly misinformed. Those who may already have some knowledge of the Shroud will be confused. Reviewers will probably take their cue from Sheed and Ward's *Own Trumpet.* For that matter, how many will be qualified to judge the book for themselves according to its real merits?[75] Hostile critics will have an easy target, and perhaps they will think they are scoring against the Shroud, whereas they will only be hitting the errors of Dr. Hynek.

The Shroud is bound to triumph in the end because it is genuine. Then all but the most resolute skeptics will realize with wonder and gratitude that we really do possess the true likeness of the Saviour of the world, along with the vivid and accurate portrayal of His sufferings in the imprints of His own body. What a pity if the day of triumph should be retarded by such a book from the pen of an overzealous advocate who may have done as much harm as an avowed opponent!

EDWARD A. WUENSCHEL, C.SS.R.

Collegium Maius S. Alfonsi
Rome

---

[75] The only review I have seen so far is that of C. C. Martindale, S.J. (*The Universe,* London, Nov. 2, 1951, p. 2). While not very well informed, it exemplifies the unfavorable impression which Dr. Hynek's book is bound to make on an intelligent reader who forms his own judgment. Father Martindale points out particularly how unconvincing is Dr. Hynek's treatment of the history of the Shroud.

KNIGHTS OF THE ALTAR

It is thought by many American priests working on the parochial level that the Church in America is in many respects over-organized. The result, they feel, is that the average priest in the big city parishes is overburdened by a complicated maze of overlapping organizations whose continued existence demands the use of a great deal more manpower than is now available. The average assistant, faced with the daily burden of trying to keep these organizations alive, and at the same time to take care of his ordinary parochial work of instructing, caring for the sick, administering the sacraments, consoling the bereaved, handling the innumerable demands of the faithful coming to the rectory, and performing the ordinary duties of his daily life, is devoting too much of his valuable time to losing causes. Wonderful though the aim of these organizations are, in many cases they are not practical. Worse yet, they are absorbing the energy of our youthful priests to the detriment of the good of souls in general. Many of the proven works of the priesthood, far more fruitful, are losing ground.

Particularly I have in mind the dearth of vocations to the priesthood and the religious life. This fact alone indicates that we are fighting a losing battle despite all our organizations. There has been some increase since the war, but it took a war to give the increase. The normal means of bringing forth vocations to the priesthood and to the religious life is badly neglected in our modern set-up. I mean personal contact with those within whom has been planted the seed of a divine vocation, personal care to develop the seed of a divine call, tending it till it blossoms forth in all its fullness. The parish priest can, in large measure, accept the blame for the failure. He is too busy, too preoccupied, oftentimes with organizations, to do anything about it. His interest in these projects, worthy though they be, has led to a woeful lack of contact in those fields which should be fruitful for the seminary and the novitiate. Especially do I have in mind our unsung and unappreciated heroes of the oftimes uncombed hair and dirty fingernails, the altar boys. Unconsciously, we have been doing them a grave injustice. For, just as the Apostles were close to our divine Lord, the altar boys should be close to the parish priest. They are the youthful disciples from whom will be chosen so frequently the other Christs. And so often that call goes unheard or unheeded because we priests are too aloof, too absorbed in other things.

The altar boys should have their own society, an exclusive one at that, since theirs is a chosen group. As with all societies, there should be a regular list of officers from president to secretary. Possibly the title of the officers can be changed, and this is even more appealing to the boys when their leader is the Grand Knight and their other officers have similar titles. The duty of the president or the Grand Knight should be to conduct the meetings, see to the execution of the weekly schedule of appointments, and administer the merit system. It would seem that the requirements of this office would demand a mature boy of high school age, studious, responsible and serious. The requirements of the other officers would follow a proportionate demand. Officers must never be elected, but rather, appointed by the priest in charge. In addition to watching out for other requirements of suitability for office, the priest in charge should keep in mind those boys who give particular indication of having a vocation to the priesthood.

The meeting should be held weekly, preferably Friday evening if possible, to avoid conflict with scholastic homework. Having it in the evening gives the boys a sense of importance which should be theirs as members of an important society. The meeting could be broken up into five different periods. Periods will vary in length of time; none should last longer than fifteen minutes and the whole meeting should be concluded within an hour. First, there should be the business meeting, including the reading of minutes, the collection of dues and other necessary business. The second part should be given over to the recitation of the Latin in unison, and also individually, and a rehearsal of ceremonies. The thirs part could be devoted to the reading of a book suitable to the altar boys, perhaps a Father Finn novel or a book such as the *Altar Boys of St. John's* by Father Scott, S.J. (This I find to be most appealing to the boys. Even the older boys look forward each week to the coming chapter.) The fourth part could be entirely social—games and the drawing of a prize. (This prize is an excellent means of attracting attendance at meetings.) Finally, a talk by the moderator and a prayer for vocations should conclude the meeting.

Of course a list of rules is necessary for the good of any organization. Observance of the rules wins for each boy a certain number of merits. Faithfulness and gracefulness of service as well as punctuality and neatness are rewarded. In order to qualify for any office an altar boy must accumulate a designated number of merits. Demerits are acquired by disobedience, failure to attend meetings, absence without reason in keeping appointments, poor recitation of the Latin, awkwardness on ceremonies. A certain number of demerits leads to a temporary suspension, and three such suspensions to a permanent suspension. The officers are the judges of each case; the priest director is the court of appeals. (Should you feel that boys are not capable of judging their friends and pals, you would be impressed by their accurate sense of justice when it is given a chance to express itself.)

In regard to weekly appointments, serving Mass and assisting at the various other devotions, a certain system must be followed. Each boy has a fellow knight or partner who takes his place in case of sickness or for any other reason which renders him unable to attend. It is the responsibility of the boy to notify his partner. Failing this, it is his responsibility to notify the president or the secretary who then is responsible for the appointment of another boy. Only as a last resort is the moderator notified. For extra services such as this a boy receives extra merits. By this means the boys are trained to be self-reliant and responsible. The system takes away a great burden from the priest director.

During that part of the meeting when training takes place, the older boys should train the younger boys. The older boys should hear the Latin of the younger boys and show them how to function on ceremonies. The initial training should be given by the priest in charge. By having the older boys train the younger boys a double purpose is achieved. First, the priest in charge is relieved of the time-consuming work of training each individual boy. However, the final stamp of approval is always given by the moderator. Secondly, the bigger boys are given a feeling of responsibility, and, at the same time, the opportunity to keep fresh in their minds the Latin responses of the Mass and also the ceremonial directives. Moreover, permitting the senior boys to share in the training of the junior altar boys gives them a sense of importance they would not otherwise experience. This participation of older boys in the training of the younger altar boys helps direct their thoughts along priestly lines and keeps them in close contact with the priest. It is, therefore, most important to keep your high school boys on the altar if you want to keep in close touch with them. Older boys take great pleasure in training younger boys and get wonderful satisfaction from a job well done. They vie with one another to see who will get his pupils through first. They are as knights to page boys, and the junior altar boys often develop a hero worship which may leave a life-time impression and frequently cement a life-time friendship which ultimately may lead *ad altare Dei.*

This is but a sketchy outline of how a parochial society such as the Knights of the Altar can function and be productive of positive good in a parish. It can be adapted to the needs of a particular parish. Parishes, as we all know, differ—no two are alike; they have distinct personalities and demands. However, boys the world over are the same basically, and the object of this society would be identical at all times and in all places. It would serve to keep the boys in close contact with the priest, it would serve to give us efficient and responsible altar boys, and better still, it would serve to keep the boys close to the priestly Heart of Christ. It should,.therefore, foster a great many more vocations to the priesthood and the religious life. Certainly we as other Christs would be closer to these budding vocations. We could be spiritual gardeners, ever near and ever ready to cultivate these buds and help to bring them to their full bloom.

Naturally, not all altar boys are called to the priestly or the religious life. But even for those who are not called, this would be an invaluable training that would serve to develop outstanding Catholic men with a love of the things of God and His Church and a relish for Catholic Action. Such an organization as the Knights of the Altar, in years to come, could supply in large measure not only the priestly manpower, but also the lay personnel and the lay leadership dreadfully lacking in our present day projects.

TIMOTHY J. SULLIVAN

Providence, R. I.

THEOLOGY AND NATIONALITY

Within the past few months there has been an increasingly obvious tendency in some quarters to insinuate or even to assert that the American theologians, as a group, contradict the teachings of their Spanish and Italian confreres on certain sections of Christian doctrine, particularly on that portion that deals with the interrelations of Church and state. This tendency is doubly unfortunate. First of all it is completely untrue to state or to imply that all the American theologians or even any considerable majority of them favor what the news magazine *Time* has been pleased to call "the 'liberal' view" on the problems of Church and state.[1] In the second place the very concept of sacred theology itself is completely misrepresented when nationality, American or any other, is depicted as an effective factor in determining theological opinions.

The first of these two points is very easily demonstrated. A mere glance at the theological articles on Church and state which have appeared over the course of the last few years in *The American Ecclesastical Review,* in the *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America,* and in *Theological Studies,* will suffice to show very clearly that there is nothing like any unanimity among American theologians in favor of "the 'liberal' view." As a matter of fact, those who oppose this view would seem to outnumber those who favor it. At any rate, it is evidently untrue to state or to imply that American theologians as a group have taken a national stand on a purely theological question.

As far as the second of these two points is concerned, any assertion or insinuation to the effect that American theologians as a group take a distinctively national or nationalistic stand on matters included in the field of Catholic doctrine is completely unfair. Whatever our individual competence may be, all of us engaged in the teaching of sacred theology try to the best of our ability to deal with this science for what it is, the *scientia fidei.* As theologians, all of us work to bring out as accurately and clearly as possible the meaning implicit within the body of divine public revelation. As the "science of the faith," sacred theology embodies the function of teaching the supernatural revealed message. This is the message which Our Lord, through His apostles, delivered to the Catholic Church, and to this society alone, to be taught and protected infallibly until the end of time. This message is contained, then, in the Sacred Scriptures and in divine apostolic tradition as in its only authentic sources. The declarations of the Church's *magisterium,* the Holy Father and the apostolic episcopal college attached to him, constitute the most important instruments available to the theologian for the effective performance of his task. These declarations of the ecclesiastical magisterium constitute as a matter of fact the immediate rule of the faith for the Catholic theologian.

---

[1] Cf. *Time,* issue of Aug. 5, 1953, p. 41.

When a foreign standard of belief or even of theological opinion has ever been intruded into the sphere of sacred theology, the results have been disastrous. Long ago, in the days of Gallicanism in France, the theologians of that country were forced to accept and to propound certain objectively spurious opinions because such was the will of the government upon which they depended. One result of this was a weakening of the faith in the men who were subject to this false discipline. Another was a cynical attitude towards the command itself. It is impossible to forget the remark of the distinguished Sorbonne theologian, Honoratus Tournely, who thus commented on the national theology he was ordered to teach.

> We must not dissimulate the fact that it is difficult, in the great mass of evidence gathered by Bellarmine, Launoy, and the rest, not to recognize the certain and infallible authority of the Apostolic See or of the Roman Church. But it is far more difficult to bring this [evidence] to agree with the Declaration of the Gallican Clergy, which we are not allowed to abandon.[2]

American theologians may be grateful to God that there is no body of teaching, incompatible with the doctrines of the Catholic faith, which "we are not allowed to abandon," in the name of nationality or of anything else. The fact that a certain set of opinions might seem to favor our own political system more than some other set, the fact that one set of teachings might serve to satisfy the demands or at least to quiet the outcries of the professional enemies of the Church: neither of these can in any way influence the judgment of the true theologian. For the support of his own opinionative conclusions the Catholic theologian appeals rather to the sources of revelation and to the living voice of the Church's authentic *magisterium*.

---

[2] Tournely, *Praelectiones theologicae de ecclesia Christi* (Paris, 1749), II, 134.

After all, as theologians, we are working to bring out clearly and accurately what God has included in the supernatural message He has given to us through Our Lord in His Church for our instruction. This is as true with reference to the portion of theology that deals with Church and state as it is with regard to any other section of the sacred discipline.

The objective truth is the same for all. The same norms or standards for the ascertainment of theological truth are available to the men of every part of the globe. The prejudices and the preferences of nationality are not to be counted among these norms or standards, even when the nation is our own.

The people who speak of our American theologians as being opposed to theologians from other parts of the world mean to refer, of course, to the realm of theological opinion. Even the most brash of these superficial commentators would hardly try to imply that the faith of the theologians in this country was any different from that of their fellows over the seas, or that American teachers of sacred theology rejected teachings set forth authoritatively and infallibly as certain, though not as dogmas, by the *magisterium* of the Catholic Church.

It is, of course, always permissible to debate within the field of theological opinion except where the supreme doctrinal authority of the Church has forbidden such debate, or has demanded the acceptance of some opinion precisely as an opinion. Yet, even in this realm, the same norms that are employed throughout all the rest of theology must be used. We have no right to accept a theological opinion merely because it might seem to sound better to uninformed non-members of the Church than its opposite.

The American theologians are aware of all of this. It is untrue and unfair to insinuate that they, as a national group, hold opinions opposed to those set forth by their fellow theologians across the seas.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The title page of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for September, 1903, is adorned with an elegant six-line Latin poem by Fr. J. Rainer, which is a eulogy of the departed Pope, Leo XIII, and a greeting to the newly elected Pontiff, Pius X. . . . Fr. William Stang, of Providence, writes on "Socialism, Its Character and Its Aims." He gives a brief history of Socialism and the writings in which it has been proposed in systematic form, beginning with Plato's *Republic*, and describes the efforts of Pope Leo XIII against the inroads of this "popular heresy." . . . "The Prehistoric Beginnings of Philosophy" by Neoscholasticus is a lengthy review of Willmann's *Geschichte des Idealismus*. . . . An interesting account of Francisco Suarez is contributed by Fr. Siegfried, of Overbrook. Those who know the distinguished Jesuit only as a great theologian will learn that he was also a saintly priest. . . . Fr. H. Castle, C.SS.R., of England, writing on "Catholicism and National Prosperity," attempt to refute the charge that Catholic lands are lacking in prosperity and culture. . . . In view of the recent death of Pope Leo XIII a correspondent in the Studies and Conferences section inquires whether the prayers which this Pontiff prescribed to be said after Low Masses are to be continued. The reply is in the affirmative. . . . Fr. Thurston, S.J., writes on the ceremony of the Pope's coronation, and an anonymous writer describes the significance of the papal tiara. . . . Another brief article narrates that there was an ancient ceremony of presenting the Pope with a bronze cock on the occasion of his coronation, as a reminder of St. Peter's fall and an admonition to be humble. This practice was discontinued in the seventeenth century. . . . Finally, the so-called Prophecy of Malachy, designating each of the Popes (beginning with Celestine II) with a distinctive title is printed in its entirety. We are told that this document originated toward the end of the sixteenth century. (It is to be noted that six titles remain after *Pastor Angelicus*, who happens to be Pope Pius XII.)

F. J. C.

Answers to Questions

EUCHARISTIC FAST FOR A PRIEST

Question: In view of the recent prescription of the Constitution *Christus Dominus* to the effect that a priest who is to celebrate an evening Mass must fast from solid food for three hours and from liquids (except water) for one hour before beginning the Holy Sacrifice, can it now be said that the celebrant of the Christmas midnight Mass must fast from solids from 9 o'clock and from liquids from 11 o'clock on Christmas eve?

Answer: The prescriptions to which our questioner refers lay down the rules to be observed regarding the eucharistic fast *on the same day* on which the Mass is to be celebrated (in the evening). We may not, therefore, conclude that these rules must be observed *on the day before* the celebration of the Mass, as would be the case if we argued that *Christus Dominus* obliges the priest who is to celebrate Mass at midnight to fast from solids from 9 o'clock and from liquids (except water) from 11 o'clock on Christmas eve. However, it could surely be *recommended,* as a matter of reverence for the Holy Eucharist, that the priest who is to officiate at the midnight Mass observe this rule.

BAPTISMAL RECORD OF AN ILLEGITIMATE CHILD

Question: Recently I baptized an illegitimate child, and entered in the register the names of the mother and of the persons who acted as sponsors. Shortly afterward the child was adopted. I have now received from the Catholic lawyer who arranged the adoption a baptismal certificate, all made out, with the names of the adopting couple recorded as the true parents and two relatives as the godparents. The lawyer requested that I sign the certificate and enter the baptism in the register in accordance with these fictitious data. What can I do in such circumstances?

Answer: There must be kept in the church files a true account of the baptized person's parentage, as far as this can be known, and this information must be available to the ecclesiastical authorities on occasions when it may be pertinent, especially if the individual later plans to marry, or to enter the religious life or the priesthood. This does not mean, however, that the full and correct data must necessarily be presented on the baptismal certificate when the reason for demanding the document is only to obtain assurance that the person received Catholic baptism—for example, on the occasion of the admittance of a child to a Catholic school or to First Communion. Illegitimacy need not be revealed in such circumstances; indeed, some fictitious data may be presented. Such, at least, is the opinion of Msgr. E. Robert Arthur, of the Washington Archdiocese, in an excellent article on this difficult problem in *The Jurist,* for January, 1953. In certain circumstances, he says, "one would hardly object if the local Ordinary should authorize the issuance of certificates for the adopted exactly like those customarily used in this country, with the names of the adoptive parents inserted as if they were the natural parents and even with others than the real sponsors given as the godparents." Msgr. Arthur would even permit both the true and the "quasi-record" to be inscribed in the register, but always in such wise that the former is available in such instances as marriage, etc. Such a procedure, however, should not be used unless it is approved by the local Ordinary.

INDIRECT CONTRACEPTION

Question: If a husband has a disease that he is likely to transmit to his wife on the occasion of sexual intercourse, may she subsequently use a douche to avoid contracting the disease?

Answer: The wife in such a case has the right to protect herself from disease by injecting into her vagina some form of medication suitable to destroy the disease germs. If possible, she should obtain a germicide that will not injure the spermatazoa; but if she cannot procure such a remedy, she may nevertheless use one that is effective in protecting her from disease, even though it also destroys the conceptive power of the semen. In this case the contraceptive result of the germicide would be an indirect effect of her action, permissible by the principle of the double effect.

A CASE OF BILOCATION

Question: I have read that a holy priest (still living) was once seen preaching in a certain church, yet at the same time was seen baptizing a baby in another church. If this was a case of bilocation (as it seems to have been) how can we explain the validity of the baptism?

Answer: It is the more common view of Catholic philosophers that one and the same body cannot be present circumscriptively in two places at the same time (Cf. Lortie, *Elementa philosophiae christianae* [Quebec, 1929], I, 411). According to this view, when bilocation seems to have taken place, as in the lives of some of the Saints, the favored person was actually in only one place, while an appearance of him was miraculously produced in the other place. Presuming that this is what happened in the case proposed by our questioner, the validity of the baptism would have been provided for if the holy priest was actually the minister of the sacrament, while the act of preaching was only an apparition. Or, the baptizer might have been an angel temporarily endowed with a human form, since God can in individual instances depute one of the heavenly spirits to perform a sacramental rite, as St. Thomas explains (*Sum. theol.*, III, q. 64, a. 7).

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

REQUIEM MASS PROBLEM

Question: In the preliminary instructions in the Missal, *De ritu servando in celebratione missae defunctorum*, there is a list of things which are omitted in those Masses. It is noted that the celebrant does not kiss the Missal at the end of the Gospel. No mention is made here about omitting the prayer, "Per evangelica dicta deleantur nostra delicta." However, in the *Ordo missae defunctorum* which follows immediately in the Missal for Requiem Masses, the following directive is given: "Quo finito [i.e., Evangelio], respondet Minister: 'Laus, tibi, Christe,' et Sacerdos mon osculatur Evangelium *neque dicit:* 'Per evangelica dicta deleantur nostra delicta.' "

Thus, the query: does the celebrant omit the words: "Per evangelica dicta . . ." after the Gospel of a requiem Mass? If so, how do we account for the omission of that directive in the preliminary notes *De ritu servando in celebratione missae defunctorum?*

Answer: The various rubricists insist that when the celebrant of a requiem Mass finishes the Gospel he neither kisses the book nor says "Per evangelica dicta, etc." It is difficult to understand why this omission has been made so consistently. In a book entitled "The Laws of Holy Mass" published in 1949 and going into great detail this very same omission is noted. Perhaps it may be a publisher's oversight due to his lack of familiarity with the rubrics.

The rubricians all tell us that the Missal is not kissed and the prayer is not recited when a requiem Mass is being offered. This rubric is further strengthened by a decision of the Congregation of Sacred Rites (No. 2956, 10).

HOLY COMMUNION OUTSIDE OF MASS

Question: In distributing Holy Communion outside of Mass, in what tone of voice is "O Sacrum Convivium, etc." recited?

Answer: DeHerdt, O'Connell, Fortescue and others all direct that the priest distributing Holy Communion outside of Mass says in a loud voice, on his return to the altar, the hymn "O Sacrum Convivium, etc."

INFANT'S FUNERAL

Question: When a child younger than five years is being waked is there anything wrong in reciting the rosary? What Mass is said at the funeral of such a child?

Answer: There is certainly nothing out of order for a priest to recite the rosary at the wake of a young child. Parents and members of the family would think it quite strange if the priest merely made a call and said no prayers. It seems to the writer that they expect the priest or pastor to say some prayers, and prayers with which they are familiar.

The *Misas de Angelis* is usually offered at the funeral of a child who has not reached the age of reason, provided that the rubrics permit a private votive Mass. If this Mass is not permitted, the Mass prescribed for the day is said.

MASS TO BE SAID

Question: Recently a priest who belonged to a religious order said Mass at our church. There was considerable discussion at the breakfast table about the Mass he said. Our Ordo permitted a votive or requiem Mass. The day according to his Ordo called for the Mass of one of the order's particular patrons. He chose to follow their Ordo and, consequently, said the Mass that corresponded to the calendar of the religious order. I argued that he was bound to follow the Ordo of the church in which he was saying Mass. Who was correct?

Answer: The visiting religious order priest was within his rights when he followed his own Ordo, since the diocesan calendar permitted a votive Mass. However, since he followed his own Ordo he should not have offered his Mass *more votivo* but rather *more festivo* with Gloria, etc. since this Mass corresponds to his office.

ORATIO IMPERATA

Question: On Sunday, June 28, 1953, occurred the feast of St. Irenaeus. In our diocese we have the *oratio imperata, pro pace*. As I said my Mass there was a great similarity between the commemoration of St. Irenaeus and the *oratio imperata*. Being confused I made these two commemorations and resolved to find out what to do in the future. What should I have done or do in the future?

Answer: The secret and the postcommunion for the Mass of St. Irenaeus are the same as those of the Mass for peace. Hence, since we do not repeat prayers in the Mass, in the future, provided the *oratio imperata pro pace* still exists, omit the commemoration, secret, and post-communion for peace.

IMITATION CANDLES

Question: Are dummy or imitation candles or painted tubing which contains small candles permitted?

Answer: Practically all liturgical writers and those interested in ecclesiastical architecture bewail the use of imitation candles and gadgets that appear as candlesticks and contain some sort of a spring to permit the use of smaller candles. They are not forbidden, however, since they have been approved or at least declared legitimate by a decision of the Congregation of Sacred Rites (No. 3448).

PONTIFICAL MASS PROBLEMS

Question: (a) I have noticed recently that at some Pontifical High Masses there will be a seventh candle lighted and at other times only six. What determines whether I as sacristan should place the extra candle on the altar? (b) At a low Pontifical Mass, regardless of the occasion or ceremony, what is the proper dress for the chaplains to the Bishop?

Answer: (a) A Bishop who is the Ordinary of the place is entitled to a seventh candle in the middle of the altar whenever he pontificates in his diocese. This privilege is not accorded to a visiting Bishop even though he has permission to use the throne. (b) While celebrating a low Mass the Bishop is assisted by two priests or chaplains wearing cassock and surplice. "If the custom exists, the chaplains may wear a stole either for the entire Mass or from the Consecration to the Communion."

MASS OF THANKSGIVING

Question: Please indicate in your column what prayers must be said in a Mass of Thanksgiving at a forthcoming celebration.

Answer: The Mass of the Trinity, of the Holy Ghost, of the Blessed Mother, or of any Saint may be said. To this Mass must be added the prayer, "Deus cujus misericordiae," under one conclusion with the principal prayer, secret and postcommunion of the Mass.

SANCTUARY LAMP PROBLEM AGAIN

Question: When the sanctuary lamp rests on a table or on a pedestal in the sanctuary just where precisely must we place this piece of ecclesiastical furniture?

Answer: The sanctuary lamp must be placed in such a position that if a straight line were drawn from the tabernacle door to the side wall the lamp would be in the area between the line and the communion railing. It must not be placed in such a position that it would be in the area back of the tabernacle door.

PLACING STATUES IN CHURCH

Question: We are renovating our sanctuary and in so doing we have a problem with statues. Is it proper to have the statue of the Blessed Mother take precedence over the Sacred Heart on one side of the sanctuary? Is it in good taste and within regulations to have the statues of two saints on the other side of the sanctuary balance the statues of the Sacred Heart and the Blessed Mother?

Answer: A hierarchy of saints must be followed. The statue of the Sacred Heart should take precedence over that of our Blessed Mother. The former should be placed on the gospel side and the latter on the epistle side of the sanctuary. Statues should not be placed too closely together. The other two statues might be conveniently placed elsewhere in the sanctuary but not on the same level with the statues of the Sacred Heart and the Blessed Mother and not too close to detract or take away from them.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Analecta

The issues of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* for the closing months of 1952 contain several important documents. The first of these is the Apostolic Constitution, *De spirituali emigrantium cura.*[1] After a lengthy, fully documented statement on the maternal solicitude of the Church for those who are forced to migrate from their homelands, the constitution sets forth norms for the spiritual care of those who emigrate. First of all, the competence of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation with regard to emigrants is established. Another chapter concerns the Delegate for the work with the emigrants. A third chapter treats of directors and missionaries for emigrants and chaplains of those who go by sea. A fourth chapter treats of the care of souls to be exercised by local Ordinaries with regard to the foreign-born. A fifth chapter speaks of the spiritual assistance to be given by the Bishops of Italy to those who migrate. The final chapter takes up the matter of the Pontifical College of Priests for Italians migrating to foreign lands.

An Apostolic Letter of Oct. 9, 1952 concerns the establishment of an Internuntiature in Pakistan.[2] An Allocution to those attending the general congress on Astronomy in Rome, given Sept. 7, 1952, discusses the panorama of the cosmos, the work of the investigative spirit, and the eternal Creator Spirit.[3] Another allocution, to those gathered for the international convention of *Pax Christi* at Assisi, Sept. 13, 1952, treats of the efforts to obtain peace, to obtain a unification of Europe, and of the Church's support through its prayers for this work; but laments the fact that the atmosphere of the present time is not yet such as to make the work successful.[4] Still another allocution, to the General Superiors of communities of women, Sept. 15, 1952, urges them to show a maternal affection in the direction of their sisters, and to see carefully to the proper formation of their sisters for the work and the task which is incumbent upon them.[5]

---

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* 44 (1952) 649, cf. also the allocution to the priests assigned to the spiritual care of Italian emigrants, given Aug. 6, 1952, *AAS* 44-773.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 712.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 732. Another significant allocution on scientific matters was given to those gathered for the international convention on histopathology of the nervous system, Sept. 13, 1952, *AAS* 44-779.

[4] *Ibid.,* p. 818.

Another allocution, on the relationship of "sport" and physical education with religion and the rules of morality,[6] discusses the nature of the body and the nature of the soul as a preliminary to a consideration of the proper attitude toward sports. Still another allocution, given Nov. 14, 1952, to the superiors and students of the Pontifical College of St. Josaphat on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the College recalls the martyrdom of the Ukraine and expresses a confident hope that the Mother of God will one day bring their sufferings to an end.[7]

The Holy Office announces the prohibition of the book of Michael Ernst, entitled, *Ehe, Eine Anthropologie der Geschlechtsgemeinschaft.*[8]

The Sacred Consistorial Congregation announced, July 29, 1952, the appointment of Most Rev. James J. Navagh as titular Bishop of Ombi and Auxiliary Bishop of Raleigh. It also announced, Aug. 8, 1952, the appointment of Most Rev. Joseph H. Hodges as titular Bishop of Rusadus and Auxiliary Bishop of Richmond.[9] Nov. 15, 1952 it announced the appointment of Most Rev. Thomas A. Boland as Archbishop of Newark.[10]

The Sacred Congregation of Rites announced a decree concerning the vesting by a Bishop of his sandals and buskins,[11] and another concerning the extension of the Motu Proprio, *Valde Solliciti,* concerning the vestiture of Cardinals, to Patriarchs, Archbishops and Bishops, as well as Abbots, secular or regular, and Protonotaries, Prelates and others enjoying the privileges of Prelates.[12]

The Secretariate of State announced the following appointments:[13]

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 823.

[6] *Ibid.,* p. 868.

[7] *Ibid.,* p. 876.

[8] *Ibid.,* p. 879.

[9] *Ibid.,* p. 747.

[10] *Ibid.,* p. 881.

[11] *Ibid.,* p. 887.

[12] *Ibid.,* p. 888.

[13] *Ibid.,* pp. 797 ff.; 842 ff.; 891 ff.

Protonotary Apostolic ad instar participantium:

Apr. 26, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Cornelius Drew and James Lynch, of the Archdiocese of New York.

May 12, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Joseph Zryd, of the Diocese of Marquette; William V. Dunn, of the Diocese of Paterson; John Sonefeld, of the Diocese of Saginaw.

June 9, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Robert M. Wagner, of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati.

Aug. 7, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Philip Cullen, Thomas Cullen, William Cusick, Francis McCormack, John R. O'Donaghue, James Rogers and Walter Tobin, of the Diocese of Mobile.

Sept. 9, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. George Habig and Joseph Trainor, of the Diocese of Youngstown; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Dorance Foley, of the Archdiocese of Dubuque.

Domestic Prelates:

Feb. 7, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Henry Boltz, Clarence Coughlan, Teresio Di Mingo, Aime Giguere, Vital Nonorgues, James Savage and Edward Ward, of the Diocese of Portland; John Bolen and Joseph Lee, of the Diocese of Wilmington.

Feb. 16, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. James Hartmann, John McDevitt and Thomas O'Reilly, of the Diocese of Cheyenne.

Feb. 19, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John A. Fearon, Henry Frank, Leo T. Keaveny, Peter Kroll, George Rauch, Francis Zitur, of the Diocese of St. Cloud.

Feb. 23, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Anthony Dimeo and Stephan Grenier, of the Diocese of Providence.

Mar. 7, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John Daly, John Duggan, George Larkin and Louis Mendelis, of the Archdiocese of Baltimore.

Apr. 24, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Emmanuel Glemet, Hubert Klenner, John Koelzer, Edward Kromenaker, of the Archdiocese of Detroit.

Apr. 26, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Edward Betowski, Francis Cagnina, John Costello, Timothy Dugan, John Fleming, Edward Giblin, Cornelius Hayes, Edward Martin, Charles McAuliffe, John Mechler, John Murphy, Edward Nilan, William O'Connor, James O'Mahony, Joseph Pernicone, John Quinn, William Ryder, Francis X. Scott and Gustave Schultheiss, of the Archdiocese of New York.

May 12, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. George Dingfelder and Martin Melican, of the Diocese of Marquette; Harold Bolton and Charles A. Roark, of the Diocese of Saginaw; James Barry, Joseph Boutin, John Gannon, John Martin, James Mitchell and Martin Tracy, of the Diocese of Worcester.

May 26, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. William Byrne, Maynard A. Connell, Louis Edelman, Joseph Gefell, Michael Krieg, Charles Mahoney and James McAniff, of the Diocese of Rochester.

June 9, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John Brinker and Edward C. Lehman, of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati.

June 27, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Norbert C. Barrett, Duane A. Brady, William Collins, William Cremer, Peter E. Donnelly, William Green, Joseph Gregor, John Hennessy, Anthony Kreimer and Albert Peikert, of the Archdiocese of Dubuque.

July 3, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Charles Leddy, of the Diocese of Manchester.

July 30, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Albert Berube, James Dolan, James Gerrard, John Silvia and Edmund Ward, of the Diocese of Fall River; Paul Campbell, Coleman Carroll, Emilio Farri, Edwin Fussenegger, Jerome Hannan and Vincent Leonard, of the Diocese of Pittsburgh.

Aug. 2, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgr. George Maxwell, of the Diocese of Fall River.

Aug. 7, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Michael Daly, Laurence Donazzan, Joseph L. Durick, Francis Foley, Daniel Harnett, Timothy Pathe, John J. Raleigh and Francis J. Wade, of the Diocese of Mobile; Harry Clinch and Daniel Keenan, of the Diocese of Monterey-Fresno.

Aug. 10, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Thomas E. O'Connell and Arthur Taylor, of the Diocese of Richmond.

Sept. 18, 1952, Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Flynn, of the Archdiocese of New York.

Secret Chamberlains Supernumerary:

Feb. 23, 1952, Very Rev. Msgrs. Arthur Geoghegan and Charles Lynch, of the Diocese of Providence.

Apr. 24, 1952, Very Rev. Msgr. Patrick Masterson, of the Archdiocese of New York.

May 12, 1952, Very Rev. Msgrs. David Spelgatti, of the Diocese of Marquette; Angelo A. Carpinella, William M. Ducharme, Joseph Lynch and David Sullivan, of the Diocese of Worcester.

May 26, 1952, Very Rev. Msgrs. Donald M. Cleary, James Cuffney, Dennis Hickey, Joseph Vogt and John Maney, of the Diocese of Rochester.

June 27, 1952, Very Rev. Msgrs. Ernest Ament, James V. Casey, Leroy G. Enzler, Arthur Halback and Frederick Heles, of the Archdiocese of Dubuque.

July 3, Very Rev. Msgrs. Joseph Doherty, Bartholomew Doyle, Francis Garvey, John Henry, Alfred Jess and Francis McCallion, of the Diocese of Camden.

July 7, 1952, Very Rev. Msgr. Patrick C. Sauter, of the Diocese of Pueblo.

July 30, 1952, Very Rev. Msgrs. Joseph Findlan and Thomas Quigley, of the Diocese of Pittsburgh.

Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, military class:

Apr. 23, 1952, Col. Henry Spitz, of the Diocese of Brooklyn.

Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:

Feb. 7, 1952, Mr. Napoleon Bisson, of the Diocese of Portland.

Feb. 8, 1952, Messrs. Emmet Blaes, William W. Graves, Harry Klenda, Thomas McNally and John Towner, of the Diocese of Wichita.

Mar. 3, 1952, Messrs. Edwin Mueller, Thomas O'Connor and Joseph Wearden, of the Archdiocese of San Antonio.

June 7, 1952, Mr. Victor Litizette, of the Diocese of Salt Lake City.

Aug. 7, 1952, Messrs. Allen M. Ames, William C. Betbeze, Simon G. Boyd, Clarence J. Brown, Vincenzo Bruno, Harrison Chastang, John R. Donaghey, John Dowe, Conrad C. Flores, George V. Gentle, Joseph P. Johnson, Martin G. Johnson, Vincent Kilborn, Ruben L. Nickelsen, Edward J. Orth, John M. O'Sullivan, Howard C. Parker, Michael J. Simpson, Edward Sullivan, Charles R. Wade and Stephan L. Zieman, of the Diocese of Mobile; Francis Diener and William Howell, of the Diocese of Monterey-Fresno.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Book Reviews

So Much, So Soon. By Katherine Burton. Preface by the Most Rev. John F. O'Hara, C.S.C. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1953. Pp. vii+ 243. $3.50.

It has often been said, and not always in a spirit of fervent charity, that all Orders and Congregations think that their founders should be canonized. Indeed, if we were to review the long list of religious founders that have enriched the Church in her long history we would find that most of the Orders and Congregations have quite legitimate claims for such a high distinction, and that the Church has recognized these claims by raising, in fact, many such founders to the honors of her altars, and by admitting the causes of many more to her earnest scrutiny. Fr. Louis Brisson, the subject of Katherine Burton's latest Catholic biography, is one of these latter, and while the author, with her usual good sense and sedulous care for the norms of the Holy See in such cases, does not plead any special case for the canonization of her latest founder, she does give us a well-drawn picture of a man whose life was lived in a close and constant union with the Saviour, a life, moreover, that will edify and at times amaze us by its tireless efforts and its noteworthy achievements.

Louis Brisson, in founding the Oblates of St. Francis de Sales—twin congregations of Fathers and Sisters—achieved for himself a high place in the annals of Catholic education in France and beyond the borders of France. The motivating force behind his efforts in this direction was his zeal for the souls of adolescent Catholics caught in the toils of the materialism and anti-Catholicism of his native land in the sad days of the latter half of the nineteenth century. In an effort to stem the rising tide of secularism of his day he conceived the practical and in many respects new idea of youth clubs and lay organizations that would later blossom forth in many forms of Catholic youth organizations in our own and other lands. From these youth clubs his great organizing talents led logically to the establishment of Catholic schools to carry even farther his work in the kingdom of youth, and by this he was almost driven—as indeed it seems that most founders are driven—to found his congregations of Oblate Fathers and Oblate Sisters. His success in his school and club work he owed to his instinctive knowledge of child and educational psychology, and his work in the founding of his two congregations was made possible by his close association with the Order of the Visitation in the role of chaplain and by his profound insight into the spirit and doctrines of St. Francis de Sales.

So Much, So Soon would be the richer if Katherine Burton had given us more of this spirit of the gentleman-saint, and especially if she had shown what part the *Spiritual Directory* of the saint played in the formation of his Oblate foundations. It was the *Spiritual Directory* that made a saint of Francis de Sales, and it is this same rule of the interior life that has accounted for the great spiritual vitality of the Order of the Visitation over the centuries since he founded them. In the Visitation Monastery of Troyes Father Brisson found a superioress who literally made of her life an apostolate of the *Directory*, and in this Visitandine, the Venerable Mother Mary de Sales Chappuis, he found an ally and a counsellor who merits well the title of co-founder of the Oblates of St. Francis de Sales. The zeal of the early Oblates and their rapid growth and diffusion in Europe, South America and South Africa, as well as in our own United States, cannot be adequately understood unless we take into account the part the *Directory* played in their spirit and formation.

But to point out that the *Directory* is missing in the life story of Father Brisson is merely to say that a formal and specific description of the rule is wanting; it is there in its substance. The loving and lovable spirit of St. Francis de Sales in all its renowned gentleness and dependence on the will of God breathes through the words and deeds of Louis Brisson from his days as a young chaplain at the Visitation until the time almost seventy years later when, his religious sons and daughters expelled from France by the anti-religious laws of the early 1900's but fast taking root in other lands in and beyond Europe, he returned to his native town of Plancy as a nonagenarian with literally no roof to call his own, to sing his last fervent *Nunc dimittis*.

The narrative is as smooth and as absorbing as any of Mrs. Burton's many popular biographies, and in Father Brisson she has come upon a character that was lovable and many-sided. His inventive genius that found an outlet for its energy in constructing intricate astronomical clocks that were the amazement of the scientific world, designing schools and kitchens and even new types of beds, is pleasantly blended with his intense spiritual activity and his bustling preoccupation with the many problems that his budding religious families met with—and all this in a man whose deepest inclinations and desires were for the contemplative life of the cloister! His opposition from the outside and even from the hierarchy—so often met with in the lives of religious founders—is told in an effective manner, and in her fluent narrative

Katherine Burton quite aptly manages to get the full ninety years of Louis Brisson into one compact and readable volume.

So Much, So Soon has been enriched by a character study of Father Brisson by the Very Rev. Thomas A. Lawless, American Vice-Provincial of the Oblates of St. Francis de Sales, which appears as a foreword after the interesting preface by Archbishop O'Hara, and by an epilogue in which the Very Rev. William D. Buckley, American Provincial of the Oblates, traces the origins and development of the Congregation in the United States in the last half century. These combine with Katherine Burton's ever-popular style to give us a book that will be read with profit and enjoyment by many American Catholics.

JOSEPH F. LYNN, O.S.F.S.

SO NEAR IS GOD. Essays on the Spiritual Life. By James M. Gillis, C.S.P. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953. Pp. 210. $3.00.

Father Gillis' other works, viz, *False Prophets, Christianity and Civilization, The Paulists,* and *This Our Day* were evaluated by their reviewers as being quite satisfactory, but his latest volume: *So Near Is God* surpasses them—it is not only satisfying, it is spiritually stimulating. Only an author with the experience, scholarliness, and ability to analyze spiritual values possessed by this "courageous champion of orthodoxy" (as Cardinal Spellman describes him) would be able to produce a book of this calibre. The twenty-six thought-provoking essays admirably succeed in their attempt "to stimulate quiet meditation and patient contemplation of religious truth."

Beginning with the Socratic ultimate in wisdom, i.e., "Know Thyself," Father Gillis leads the reader on to the Christian ultimate which is to "know God." Masterful essays answering such questions as why God must be a hidden God, what kind of God He is, and how near He is to us, are included, the author suggesting that the best way of finding the answers is through silence and solitude.

Then there are entertaining and instructive analyses of religion and prayer. The former very convincingly show how futile are the efforts of the godless who try to root religion out of the heart of man. Nations have undertaken to slay it with slogans, massacre it with martyrs and destroy it with the razing of churches, but it always returns—so natural is it to man.

As for the conferences on prayer—they are really messages of hope. The author compares the difficulties that we encounter in praying with the experiences of the saints, and avers that these latter are the more successful because they exercise a greater comprehension and more penetrating intelligence regarding the things around them. Where we see only a blade of grass or a beautiful sunset, they see the hand of God.

Indeed, all of us should pray—not only because we are commanded to—but because we are made just that way. It should be just as natural for us to open up our hearts to our Maker as it is for a bird to fly, or a fish to swim. Here is the answer that is ignored by the "new psychology" which urges us "not to repress our natural instincts" and "let ourselves go." It might very well be that if more people gave vent to so natural an impulse, the world would have fewer psychotics. Did not Lacordaire once remark that prayer often keeps us from going mad?

There are other essays: on conscience, temptation, sin, meditation and the effects of Holy Communion. All are wholesome food for the spiritually hungry, suitable to every taste, easily digested and profitable for everybody.

The two concluding chapters are devoted to stirring reflections on Our Lady and on heaven. Father Gillis expresses gratitude to the Church for fostering devotion to Mary and then portrays the Blessed Virgin as *the* example of sanctity brought within easy reach of mankind. She is strictly one of our own, with the same human nature as we have and with a beauty of life that has fascinated mankind far and beyond that which has been offered by any saint. Furthermore, he says, "whatever there is in this modern world of gentleness and modesty, continency and chastity, is largely due under God to the consecration of boys and girls, men and women to her whom we salute in the litanies *mater purissima, mater castissima.*"

As for heaven, the writer pictures it by negating the disadvantages of this life. He severely chastises those who call into question its existence by reminding them that we who believe it *is,* "stand with God, with Christ and with the whole race of man."

All told, the sublimity of the topics discussed in no way mar the entertaining features of the conferences and this reviewer does not hesitate to say that it would be a mistake not to have this volume on your library shelf.

TIMOTHY HOLLAND, S.S.J.

THE SPIRITUAL DIRECTOR. By Fr. Gabriel, O.D.C. Translated by a Benedictine of Stanbrook Abbey. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1952. Pp. 131. $2.50.

This is the third of a series of small treatises explaining the doctrine of St. John of the Cross. The other two—*Acquired Contemplation* and *Visions and Revelations*—deal with attitudes towards special phases of spiritual development, whereas this work takes up St. John of the Cross's ideas about spiritual direction in general.

St. John of the Cross approaches the problems of spiritual theology at one time from the viewpoint of the reactions of the soul co-operating with grace, and at another from the point of view of God's action in the soul. He utilizes both the principles of sound psychology and those of theology. This is especially manifest in his treatment of the problem of aridity.

It is Father Gabriel's contention that, as the more urgent problems of spiritual direction occur precisely in the realm of psychology, those who refuse to consider the psychological aspect completely are unable to evaluate these problems and must inevitably leave them unsolved. "Where such an attitude prevails," he writes, "spiritual theology can no longer fulfill what is generally recognized to be its function, namely to give suitable guidance to souls at all stages of the spiritual life. Hence, from the study of St. John's teaching there emerges at least this first point: psychology must not be eliminated from spiritual theology" (p. 59).

With this as his background, Father Gabriel defines spiritual theology as the theological study of the evolution of the spiritual life in its psychological conditions (p. 61).

St. John of the Cross constructed a complete synthesis of the spiritual life. This synthesis Father Gabriel expounds in a masterly fashion, dwelling at some length upon the delicate problems of purification and transition. Most satisfying is the treatment of the Christological implications of this synthesis. The soul's attitude toward Christ at each stage of its journey through the purgative, illuminative, and unitive ways is clearly expounded. And the question of whether there is any abandoning of the Sacred Humanity in the contemplation of obscure Faith is answered at length with unusual competence.

Because the solutions to spiritual problems contained in this book are given with special reference to St. John of the Cross, there is some danger that the reader will get the impression that they are highly specialized knowledge, not generally applicable in the direction of souls. A more readily usable manual could be constructed by eliminating what is strictly Carmelite material and combining the principles of this work and the two previous treatises. Nevertheless, this book, just as it is, makes a very useful addition to the library of priests entrusted with the direction of souls.

Unfortunately, the translation and the printing leave much to be desired. Stanbrook Abbey has not put into this book its usual care and accuracy. Passing over certain misspelled and questionable English expressions, one finds the Italian word *totali* translated in one place (p. 93) by *wholesale and complete,* and in another (p. 106) by *wholesale* alone. Now *wholesale* indicates quantity whereas *totali,* in its particular reference here, is an adjective which modifies in a qualitative sense. Total is a good English word and would fit better here. On p. 100 the Italian expression *Gesu Dio* is rendered *Jesus-who-is-God,* but on p. 102 the same expression is translated *Jesus as God* without any apparent reason for the difference.

One wonders why The Newman Press found it necessary to have this book printed in Ireland. The type used is so small and the inking job so poor that reading is made unnecessarily difficult.

FATHER THOMAS, O.C.D.

THE MORALITY OF PRIZEFIGHTING. By George C. Bernard, C.S.C. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1952. Pp. x + 190. $2.00.

Not a few spectators, after witnessing a prize fight or seeing pictures of it, have voiced the opinion that no amount of money would induce them to undergo such punishment. It is Father Bernard's thesis that those who do submit to such punishment and who inflict it upon others, even though they receive a generous financial reward, are engaging in an activity that is *per se* unlawful. He is careful to make the distinction between boxing as such, and prize fighting as it is conducted today. His strictures are directed principally against the latter.

The author admits that his undertaking may be regarded as imprudent, because he is opposing a national sport that has long been regarded as good, or at least as permissible, and because his casting doubt on the morality of this activity may create a bad conscience in some individuals, without effecting any change in the *status quo.* Father Bernard's position, however, is that the morality of prize fighting has already been called into question, and that his present work is no innovation. His efforts, therefore, are devoted to giving "a more lengthy list of facts and arguments to substantiate an existing opinion."

In the introduction to his dissertation, the author discusses briefly the nature and value of sport, with special attention being given to boxing and pugilism. The lawfulness of boxing itself is admitted, when it is "a contest of skill rather than strength, of agility rather than power, and of speed rather than force." The evolution of pugilism from its earliest recorded days, long before the birth of Christ, is given a brief treatment. It is brought out that only in comparatively recent times did prize fighting become respectable. Some interesting facts are presented with regard to regulations and practices among different types of pugilists: professional, amateur and collegiate.

The main portion of Father Bernard's dissertation is devoted to a study of prize fighting as it exists today, with an extensive report on medical studies that have been made in relation to prize fighting. Attention is then given to related moral problems, in the light of the information previously set forth and with particular emphasis upon the principles governing the Fifth Commandment. The concluding pages of the work are devoted to certain corollaries concerning amateur and collegiate boxing.

Father Bernard's discussion of modern prize fighting dwells upon certain abuses, testimony to the existence of which is advanced from present and former fighters, as well as from sports writers. Much of what is reported in this section is common knowledge. Thus, for example, it is stated that prizefighting today is big business, and that it works on a competitive basis. It is not merely for fun. "A prizefighter is a man paid to hit and be hit, thus giving some kind of satisfaction to the paying public."

The crowd at a prize fight wants to see a knockout, and often expects to do so. The excitement engendered by combat leads many to lose control of their emotions. They have paid to see a fight, and the rougher the better. A football or hockey crowd, the author remarks, may become hysterical with excitement, but it does not demand physical injury, as does the fight crowd. Father Bernard thus lays emphasis not only on the effect produced in the spectators by the fight that they witness, but also on the influence that the spectators have on the brutality of the contest in many instances. One can hardly deny the author's statement that, generally speaking, the customers do not want boxing; they want slugging.

Circumstances such as these, however, are merely accessory to the main argument proposed by the author, who holds that prize fighting fails against the moral principle that it is wrong to permit injury or the danger of injury to oneself without a sufficient reason, and that it is likewise wrong deliberately to injure or to attempt to injure one's opponent. Father Bernard concedes that moderate bodily hurts may be inflicted on another person, if he is not unwilling and there is a reasonable purpose. Moreover, moderation must be judged according to the circumstances, especially those of the person against whom the blow is struck. Nevertheless, the author writes, blows forceful enough to jar the brain, smash nose cartilage, and gash the eyes and lips of persons trained to absorb punishment, seem to be beyond the limit of moderation. They may not be inflicted upon even a willing receiver except for a reason more grave than recreation, training, or monetary gain.

Avoiding exaggerated claims as to the frequency of serious injuries, Father Bernard lays great emphasis upon the possible damage caused to the brain by repeated blows to the head, damage not quickly or easily recognizable at first, especially by the lay observer. Among others, there is the statement of one former heavyweight, who left the ring because of the harm that it was doing to him. This man is quoted as saying that a fighter suffers as much from punches taken in training as from those received in a fight. He declares that even the protection of a headguard cannot forestall jarring of the brain. "That's what causes the trouble. . . . It's not a single punch; it's the constant jarring." Impressive medical testimony is offered to substantiate this danger, and to lend force to Father Bernard's argument against the licity of modern prize fighting.

One may question his assertion that few theologians have applied to this matter the principles governing the Fifth Commandment, because their very discussion of the question necessarily involves these principles. It would be better to say that others have applied them, but have reached conclusions different from his own. The principal argument of those disagreeing with Father Bernard's thesis would appear to be that any serious damage, at least, done to a fighter is unintentional and *per accidens,* that there is sufficient reason to permit the lesser injuries which occur more frequently, and that the percentage of serious injuries in many instances is lower than it is in other contact sports. To this reviewer, Father Bernard's argument seems to be the stronger, so far as modern prizefighting is concerned, and that is the main object of his thesis. As he points out, in all sports but boxing, a player who deliberately tries to injure an opponent is characterized as a "dirty player." Only in prize fighting is the purpose to render one's opponent incapable of continuing, and to deprive him of his senses, if possible. The unconsciousness or injury resulting from a fighter's punches can hardly be considered accidental and unintentional. Even when the resulting injury is far more serious than was expected, it is still the result of a blow that was struck purposely.